SELF LEARNING MATERIAL

POLITICAL THOUGHT

COURSE: P.SC. – 101

FIRST SEMESTER

POLITICAL THOUGHT

BLOCK – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6

DIRECTORATE OF OPEN AND DISTANCE LEARNING
DIBRUGARH UNIVERSITY
DIBRUGARH – 786004

POLITICAL THOUGHT
COURSE : P.SC. – 101

ISBN NO. 978-93-82785-85-9

Contributor :

Block – I	Unit – 1	Robin Hazarika Asstt. Prof. of Kamargaon College, Golaghat
Block – I	Unit – 2	Phulmoni Das Asstt. Prof. of Political Science Dpt., Dibrugarh University
Block – II	Unit – 1	Dr. Tarun Gogoi Asstt. Prof of D.R. College, Golaghat
Block – II	Unit – 2	Dr. Partho Protim Borthakur Asstt. Prof of Makum College, Makum
Block – III	Unit – 1 & 2	Dhrubajyoti Saikia Asstt. Prof of Kakojan College, Jorhat
Block – III	Unit – 3	Puja Dihingia Asstt. Prof of DODL, DU
Block – IV	Unit – 1	Dr. Anita Sharma Asstt. Prof of MDKG College, Dibrugarh
Block – IV	Unit – 2	Dr. Mridul Dutta Asstt. Prof of D.H.S.K. College, Dibrugarh
Block – IV	Unit – 3	Ranendra Khound Asstt. Prof of DDR College, Chabua
Block – V	Unit – 1	Priyanka Sharma Asstt. Prof of Centre for Women's Studies Dibrugarh University
Block – V	Unit – 2 & 3	Ranendra Khound Asstt. Prof of DDR College, Chabua
Block – VI	Unit – 1	Pinky Das Asstt. Prof of J.B. College, Jorhat
Block – VI	Unit – 2	Kalyan Dutta Asstt. Prof of S.M.D. College, Namti
Block – VI	Unit – 3	Dr. Ankita Baruah Assam Women University, Jorhat

Editor :

Late Mrigandra Narayan Das
Retired Prof. Dibrugarh University

Published on behalf of the Directorate of Open Distance Learning, Dibrugarh University by the Directorate, DODL, D.U. and printed at Insui Printer, D.U. Market Complex, Dibrugarh – 786004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Directorate of Open and Distance Learning, Dibrugarh University duely acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this Self-Learning Material.

POLITICAL THOUGHT

COURSE : P.SC. – 101

BLOCK 1
UNIT:1
PLATO

1.0 Objectives:

After going through this unit you will be able

- To know the background of Plato's Philosophy
- To know about Plato's Theory of Justice
- To know about Plato's Theory of Education
- To know Plato's concept of Communism
- To differentiate between Plato's communism and modern communism
- To know about Plato's theory of Philosopher King
- To know about Plato's theory of Ideal State

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

Plato the first Greek political thinker and Philosopher, the disciple of Socrates and the teacher of Aristotle, was born in Anthers (424/423BC-348/347BC). He was born in a time when Athenian democracy was in crisis and witnessed the most troubled period of Greek history. The execution of Socrates filled his heart with scorn for democracy and mob. These greatly disturbed him and he was convinced that the only way out was to establish the rule of philosopher king. Plato established an academy which is often described as the first institute of higher education in the western world. In his academy long discourses and discussions of purely argumentative nature took place and an effort was made to find out the causes of human discontent and political instability. On this background Plato established his philosophy and along with his student Aristotle helped to lay the foundation of western Philosophy and science. The philosophy of Plato is contained in the Republic (386BC), The Statesman (360BC) and the Laws (347bc). In this unit you will study about Plato's theory of justice, his views on education, Communism of wives and property, I deal state and philosopher king.

1.2. Plato's theory of Justice:

Plato attached great importance to the concept of justice because he believed that proper justice could remove all ills of a state. But Plato gives an unconventional theory of justice. The conventional theory of justice defines justice in the legal sense of the term and theories of justice are linked to theory of rights. Plato's theory is unconventional because Plato considers justice as individual virtue as well as virtue of social institutions. Secondly it is an unconventional theory because it talks about justice in trams of duties rather than in terms of rights.

While explaining his theory of justice, Plato starts by discussing the various prevailing theories of justice and after rejecting them puts forwards his own views. For better understanding of Plato's views on justice it is desirable to examine the various prevailing theories of justice

1.2.1 (a)**Traditional theory of justice**:

(Cephalous and Polemarchus) The traditional theory of justice was propounded by Cephalous and Polemarchus. According to Cephalous "Justice is doing your duty and paying your dues." Plato accepts duty aspect of this view but rejects second aspect. According to Plato it will not be justice if person retains weapon to a mad man it can harm others in society. Justice can't be relative or harmful, justice is universal.

According to Pole Marchus, "Doing good to your friend and evil to enemy is Justice.'' Plato rejects it because it is not always easy to understand who is your

enemy and who is your friend. A friend can be an enemy in disguise. Justice never does harm to any body and it is for welfare of all.

1.2.2(b) Radical theory of justice:

(Thrasy Machus)The radical theory associated with Sophists and propounded by Thrasy Machus. According to him, "Justice is the interest of stronger." In other word it believes in the principle of might is right. It is also rejected by Plato.

1.2.3 (c)**Pragmatic theory**:

The pragmatic theory of justice is stated by Glaucan. For Glaucan, "Justice is the interest of weaker". Weaker people compile to form state. Plato contradicts theory of Glaucon. Firstly, Glaucon considers justice as artificial thing, a product of social convention, justice is manmade. But for Plato justice is eternal, permanent, natural and not man made. Justice is universal and does not discriminate between weak and strong.

1.2.4 plato's own views on Justice:

Thus adopting the dialectical approach Plato contradicts the above theories of justice, brings about their limitations and propounds his own theory of justice.

Plato has discussed theory of justice at two levels

(a) At the level of state.

(b) At the level of individual.

Plato believes that justice resides both in the individual as well as the state. As state is magnified form of individual, he tries to explain it first with the help of state as it is easier to understand things in magnified form.

According to Plato like human mind the state has three ingredients – Reason, spirit and appetite, which are represented by the rulers, soldiers and farmers (produces) respectively. Each of these three makes valuable contribution towards the creation of the state. Justice for the society can be realized if each group performs the function which it is best suited to perform without interfering in the sphere of the others. In other words according to Plato, justice in the state meant that the three social classes (rulers, warriors and producers) performed the deliberative and governing, defense and production without interfering with the functions of others. Thus justice implies a sort of specialization and the principle of non- interference and harmony.

In defining justice in the individual level Plato pointed out that every human soul has three qualities rational, spirit and appetitive. In each soul one of these three qualities would be the predominant faculty. Individuals in whom the rational faculty was predominant would constitute the ruling class and virtue of such soul was wisdom. Those in whom spirit was the predominant quality were the warriors or soldiers, and the virtue of such soul was courage. Together rulers and soldiers constitute the guardian class. The individuals whose souls were appetitive, they were the artisans, the producing class. The quality of such an appetitive soul was temperance. So, according to Plato justice in the individual meant that every individual perform his function according to his natural aptitude (in his own sphere) and he was assigned a place in society according to his natural aptitude and skills.

A diagrammatic representation of Plato's conception would be as follows : -

Vintue	**Soul**	**Class**
Wisdom	Rational	Rulers
Courage	Spirited	Soldier/warriors
Temperance	Appetitive	Artisans

Plato's concept of justice is based on three principles –

(1) It implies functional specialization viz allotment of specific function to each according to his capacity and merit.
(2) It implies non interference by various classes in each other's sphere of duty and concentration on its own.
(3) It implies harmony between the three classes representing wisdom, courage and temperance respectively.

1.2.5 Features of Plato's theory of Justice:

1. Justice is virtue.
2. Justice is both private as well as public virtue.
3. Justice is universal.
4. Justice is for welfare of every one.
5. Justice is functional specialization. Each unit of society performs its specific task. Thus different demands of society develop inter dependence. This interdependence results into cohesiveness in the society.

1.2.6 Criticism of Platonic Concept Justice:

Plato's concept of justice has been criticized on following grounds-

(a) Plato's theory of justice has no scope for individual freedom. Plato only looks at the duty aspects and neglects aspects of rights.

(b) Plato's theory of justice is unacceptable in present age of democracy. It is based on inequality among individuals. It establishes hierarchial Society. It completely subordinates individual to state.

(c) Plato's concept of justice is based on moral principles and lacks legal sanction in so far it is not enforceable.

(d) According to Plato's concept of justice Philosopher king is himself the embodiment of justice. He is not bound by any laws and given absolute powers to administer justice. But absolute power and monopoly in the hands of a few persons or class of persons is bound to lead to corruption and misuse of power. Power corrupts man and absolute power corrupts absolutely is an old dictum.

(e) Justice should be uniform and universal .But Platonic justice has special inclination for philosopher class. The very idea of having a privilege class defects the whole concept of justice.

(f) Plato's concept of justice gives rise to totalitarianism and completely ignores the humanitarian principles like equality, individualism and freedom.

(g) According to Professor Popper, Platonic concept of justice leads us to class state. According to him, "Plato calls for privilege just while we usually mean by justice rather the absence of such privilege." Thus justice should not create privileges but on the other hand it should be devoid of privileges.

1.2.7 Conclusion:

But in spite of all this criticism there is no denial that the roots of all evils in states today is lack of justice. Plato emphasizes that justice should be the basis of social system. If Platonic concept of justice is properly understood it shall mean

devotion to duty and functional specialization. Plato greatly emphasized on duty aspect of citizens. He emphasized that nature of state is shaped by the character of inhabitants. Another significance of Plato lies in the fact that he gives superior position to the knowledge in society. He emphasized that knowledge is a foundation of good governance. Plato's concept of justice is wide and broad-based. Properly speaking while discussing his concept of justice he has become practical rather than ideal. Moreover, his concept of justice is based on the idea of social and collective good. He has always viewed individual as a social animal and part of the society. The greatest theoretician of justice in contemporary time John Rawls has been greatly influenced by Plato.

Check your progress: 1

A. Why Plato's theory of Justice is called an unconventional theory of Justice?
B. What is Justice according to Plato?

1.3. Plato's theory of Education:

Education is very central in Platonic thought. The topic of education is dealt in very extensive manner in his book Republic. This is the reason Rosseau called "Republic" best treatise ever written on education.

Plato's theory of education is intimately linked with his theory of justice. According to Plato justice is nothing but virtue in action and virtue is nothing but knowledge. It is the duty of the state to impart that knowledge to all three classes by proper education and training so that they can perform their duties efficiently and properly. In other words education is the main tool to establish ideal state and at the same time providing education is the most important duty of state. Plato's theory of education brings Plato near to contemporary times.

Plato's education has individual as well as social aspect. On the one hand it makes the individual realize knowledge which is synonymous with virtue. It enables the individual to turn the eye of his soul to the inward reality and truth. On the other hand it is a social process through which the units of society become instinct with social consciousness and learn to perform the duties of their respective field. Plato makes a harmonious mixing of these two aspects of education in his ideal system of education.

1.3.1 Methods of Plato's Education:

Plato observed two existing patterns of education- Athenian and Spartan. He synthesized the thesis part of both systems and evolved his own scheme of education.

In Athens education was mainly in private hands and it depended upon the will of the parents to educate their children in the manner they liked best. State had no responsibility in it. Women did not have access to education. Plato did not like the Athenian system of education. However, he liked the content of Athenian system. In Athens there was focus on the study of philosophy, music, literature and geometry. These contents lead to development of rational faculty in man.

On the other hand Spartan system of education is fully controlled by state. The children were separated from their parents at the age of four and were placed under the care of prefects. Plato was impressed by Spartan system. He also liked compulsory military education and non-discriminatory nature of Spartan system which allowed both man and women to be educated.

Plato synthesized institutional features of Sparta with the content of Athens. Plato's systems of education aimed at promoting social welfare and help the individual in realizing the reality.

1.3.2 Features of Platonic system of Education:

(i) Education is state controlled and compulsory.
(ii) Education is both for male and female.
(iii) Plato was in favour of strict censorship of all literary and artistic work to ensure that the youth did not come under the bad moral influence.
(iv) Plato's education aimed at moral as well as physical development of children.
(v) The chief objective of Plato's education was to produce philosopher king.
(vi) Education is life long Process.
(vii) He combines theoretical as well as applied aspects of education.
(viii) Plato gives focus on education of guardian class. He elaborates in depth the education system for guardian class. He does mention about education of appetite class but he does not go into detail.

1.3.3 Plato's Curriculum of Education:

Plato recommended a state controlled, compulsory and comprehensive scheme of education. His educational curriculum could broadly be divided into two stages-

(i) Elementary education
(ii) Higher education.

(i)**Elementary Education:** The Elementary education was further sub divided into three stages-

a. **From birth to six years:** The first stage lasted from birth to the age of six years. At this stage both the boys and girls are to be given education in language. The children are also taught basic facts of religion, religious institutions, music and moral education.
b. **From 6-18 years**: During this period the child is to be taught music, gymnastic, literature and other general things. The music is essential for the development of soul and gymnastic for the development of body. Thus, at this stage both body and soul are to be developed.
c. **From 18-20 years:** At this sub stage both men and women are given compulsory military education.

(ii) **Higher Education:** The higher stage of education lasts from 20 to 35 years of age. After the age of 20 a selection is to be made and those showing aptitude for science and philosophy are to be given higher education. The higher education is also subdivided into two sub-stages. The first phase extending from 20 to 30 years of age and the second phase extending from 30 to 35.

During the first phase subjects like Mathematics, Astronomy, Logic, geometry and other sciences are to be taught. At the age of 30 another selection test is held and only those who qualify it are given a further training for five years i.e. up to the age of 35. During this stage emphasis was to be laid on philosophy and dialectics, because Plato believed that dialectic is the only system of knowledge through which highest reality could be achieved. This stage of education is essentially meant to create the philosopher king.

From the age of 35, the Philosophers are expected to rule up to the age of 50 and then retire and resume study for the contemplation of God.

Such a study continued up to the end their lives. Hence Plato's education was a lifelong process.

1.3.4 Criticism of Plato's scheme of education:

(i) Plato's scheme of education was meant for the guardian class alone. He ignored the education of producer class.

(ii) Plato's scheme of education was completely controlled by state which restricted autonomous thinking.

(iii) Plato's scheme of education was not logical in so far there was no relationship between one stage to the other. During the first stage he insisted on study of music and gymnastics which were hardly capable of developing thinking capacities amongst the young stars. The second stage insisted on the use of reasoning faculties. It is difficult to understand how the learners who have not developed thinking capacity during the first stage of education shall be able to adjust in the second stage.

(iv) Plato's entire education process is too long. After devoting a major portion of his life to education alone the rulers are hardly left with any time to devote to other pursuits.

(v) In Plato's scheme of education, no emphasis has been given to the education in the art of administration. The philosopher king who is required to administer the state is not given any training in the art of administration or other allied problems. So, education of philosopher rulers, as Plato contemplates will not create political rulers. Rather it will produce academic theorists who may not be fit for ruling.

1.3.5 Conclusion:

Despite these shortcomings and defects of Plato's scheme of education it can't be said that Plato's education system is irrelevant and unpractical. Relevance of Plato's education can be drawn from the following point-

First, Plato's education system is very comprehensive. It touches all aspects of personality, moral, physical, spiritual and mental.

Secondly, Plato was first person to recognize that education should be lifelong process.

Thirdly, He talked about both theoretical and practical education.

Fourthly, Plato's scheme of education makes no discrimination between men and women. According to him both men and women should be given same type of education.

Fifthly, Plato considers education as most effective medicine for treatment of diseased society. He wanted to remove all the ills of the society through proper education.

Check your progress:2

A. **Who called the "Republic" the best treatise ever written on education?**
B. **What is the main objective of Plato's theory of Education?**

1.4. Plato's concept of Communism:

Plato's concept of Communism is intimately connected with his theory of justice and ideal state. Plato is of the opinion that in order to achieve justice and to have an ideal state it is essential that there should be communism of wives and property. He believes that both family and private property are serious challenges to the loyalty of the rulers. Property and family stands in the way of philosopher rulers to devote themselves fully to the service of the community. He therefore says that if

rulers even acquire homes or lands or money of their own they will become house keepers and husbandmen instead of guardians, enemies and tyrants instead of allies of other citizens and they will pass on their life in much greater terror of internal rather than external enemies. In other words Plato held that the combination of the political and economic power is bound to lead to corruption and degradation in the state and an efficient system of administration could operate only if the economic power is absolutely divorced from the political power. Therefore, he pleads that those who exercise political power should have no economic motives and those who are engaged in economic activities should have no share in political power.

The basic concern for Plato behind providing system of communism is to tackle the problem of corruption. Two main reasons that promote corruption are private property and family. Those in power use their position to earn material well being. According to Plato influence of family is more problematic than influence of money or power. Family promotes nepotism. It creates inequality among citizens. Ruling class gives preference to his people. Family is also a factor behind appropriation of property hence family and properties have corrupting influence. If state is corrupt it faces problem of legitimacy and leads to political instability. Hence for Plato communism of property and family is the best way to tackle this problem.

Plato built up his theory of communism of wives and property on political and psychological basis. According to Plato psychologically it is essential that the guardians which include the rulers and the warriors should be relieved of the material worries so that it might be able to concentrate entirely on public service. According to him, the acquisition of property and family would stand in the way of philosopher rulers to devote themselves fully to the service of the community and they could not become ideal king.

From political and economic points of view Plato believed that it is essential that political and economic power should be divorced from each other for efficient system of administration, because combination of the both power leads to corruption and degradation of the state. Therefore Plato talked of communism of property and wives for the guardian class.

1.4.1 Communism of Property:

Plato talked of communism of private property for the philosopher kings and soldiers. He feared that the possession of private property would give rise to selfish considerations and deviate the attention of the philosopher rules from public service. He therefore deprived the two ruling classes of the rights to property. In the words of Sabine Plato felt that, “To cure the greed of rulers there is no way short of denying them the right to call anything their own. Plato insisted that the rulers should not possess private property because it bound to undermine the value of virtue. Which was the most important ingredient of the ruling class.

In the case of soldiers Plato felt that the private property will deviate their attention from the noble object of defending their motherland from external aggressions. The attraction to private property might also make them weak both morally and culturally. He therefore stressed the necessity of communism of property to the soldiers also. In the words of Plato, “The philosopher kings and the military class should not possess any private property because property breeds selfishness and conflict of interests. Renunciation of property will ensure full devotion of rulers to state duties.”

1.4.2 Criticism of communism of Property:

Plato's concept of the communism of property has been put under sever eroticism. Plato's own disciple Aristotle criticized his theory of communism on the following grounds: -

1. First, Acquisition or ownership is natural instinct of man and deprive anyone of it is contrary to the basic human nature and can prove harmful for the development of the society. With doing away of the private property there would hardly be any incentive for hard work and healthy struggle, which is so important for the progress of society, shall come to an end.
2. Plato's system of communism is meant only for the ruling classes and excludes the producer class. But the producer class form the majority of the society and any scheme which excludes the majority class bound to be a failure.
3. Plato's communism of property is bound to result in loss of production because there will be none to look after common and joint property. There will be no personal interest but impersonal compulsions which will definitely be unhealthy and not in the national interest.
4. Plato's concept sacrifices individual at the altar of state which is in no way healthy. Plato has all long believed that individual is means to an end but he has forgotten that he is an end himself. Since this philosophy is opposed the individual' therefore it can't be justified.
5. Plato's communism destroys the institution of Private property which is a symbol of civilization. By abolishing it as Aristotle points out, it will destroy the sentiments of charity and benevolence the essentials of a healthy society.
6. As Aristotle says, the unity of the state should be promoted by proper education and not by communism.
7. Aristotle criticises Plato for providing material remedy to the spiritual diseases through communism. It is rather difficult to understand that material remedies will cure spiritual diseases. Accordingly it is difficult to understand the logic of his philosophy.

In addition to the above points of criticism leveled by Aristotle, Plato is also criticized because he completely neglects the slaves who formed an important part of the Greek population and played an important part in the Greek economy. Through Plato has tried to retain the institution of slavery on the plea that it will help in the development of faculties of philosopher king yet he has not covered this class in his present arrangements.

1.4.3 Conclusion:

It can't be denied that some of the points of criticism advanced by Aristotle and others against Plato's concept of communism of property are quite valid but it would certainly be wrong to under estimate the importance of his theory. Plato rightly emphasized that the combination of the economic and political powers in the same hands is bound to give rise to corruption. Further, Plato's theory is a logical and essential extension of his theory of justice and Philosopher king which would have collapsed without communism of private property. As Sabine says, "Plato's communism has therefore a strictly political purpose. The order of ideas is exactly the reverse of that which has mainly animated modern socialist, utopia; he does not mean to use government to equalize wealth, but he equalizes wealth in order to remove a disturbing influence in government.''

1.4.4 Communism of wives:

Plato's concept of communism of wives is the logical extension of his scheme of communism of property. He was of the view that the abolition of the institution of private property without the abolition of the family would result in the failure of his scheme and private property would appear in some different form. Plato believed that man always gives priority to the interest of his family and children over broader interests of the nation. He therefore laid greater emphasis on communism of wives. According to Barker, " Plato sees in the family on the one hand a root of selfishness, which may grow into a family feud and civic sedition, and on the other hand a drag on development, which prevents men and women from being what they might be and discharging the functions which they might discharge and therefore, prevent them from being just themselves or making just the state in which they live. The day of its abolition will be the day of inauguration of unity for the state, of liberty for the individual and of justice for both. He further says that, "The abolition of family life among the Guardians is thus inevitable corollary of their renunciation of private property. Plato recognizes that property and family are interdependent facts."

Plato's scheme of communism of wives is based on certain basic principles which are –

(1) Plato's scheme of communism of wives is essentially meant for the guardian class and the vast majority of population consisting of peasants, artisans etc are not covered by it.

(2) The family life is a serious and powerful rival to loyalty to the state because hoarded wealth and secluded women are likely to detract from the devotion of the guardian class and give rise to the feeling of selfishness. Communism of wives was bound to curb the sentiments of selfishness and emancipate the woman from the drudgery of home, and thus enable them to devote to the service of the state.

(3) In Plato's communism of family, there is no system of permanent wedding among the guardian class and all the women are to be common to all men and vice versa.

(4) All guardians (both men and women) are to live together in common barracks.

(5) It was the duty to the state to arrange a temporary mating between the best men and best women for one year to produce requisite number of children. The mating was to take place between women of 20 to 40 years of age and men 25 to 55 years of age. Mating beyond this age limit was prohibited.

(6) All children soon after their birth were to be separated from their mothers. The responsibility for rearing of children was to be entrusted to state nurses. The children were also to be provided with necessary education at the state expenses. In this system neither the child knows his parents nor the parents know their child.

(7) Weak and disfigured children were to be killed soon after their birth so that they may not prove to be a burden for the state.

(8) Plato's communism of family is intended for the purpose of bringing unity in the state.

(9) Plato feels that communism of family is an essential and necessary condition for the realization of justice and virtue.

(10) In contrast to communism of property which insisted on common renunciation of property by the guardian class, Plato's communism of wives insists on common ownership of women by the guardian class.

1.4.5 Reasons for Communism of Family:

Plato suggests communism of family for guardian class. This system has there purposes-

(1) Political Purpose.
(2) Moral Purpose.
(3) Eugenic Purpose.

(1) **Political Purpose:** Communism of wives was an essential condition for Plato's united state. He felt that family was the greatest stumbling block in the unity of the state even more than private property. Because family affection was a potent rival of loyalty to the state. At the same time Plato also thought that communism of family would solve the problem of corruption. Family is major factor inducing man to become corrupt. If guardian class has no family they will treat all citizens as their own children. It will ensure legitimacy in system.

(2) **Moral purpose:** It was associated with upliftment of women. State took over the job performed by family. Family is an institution based on sexual division of labour. Women are occupied with the task of family so they don't have time to participate in public life and become virtuous. Communism of family would result in liberation of women and talent of women would not go waste and could be utilized in wider interest of state and society.

(3) **Eugenic purpose:** Another reason advocated by Plato in support of his philosophy was that there should be an improvement in race. He felt that by controlling system of marriage it was possible to improve the Greek race. State would select the partners for procreation purpose.

1.4.6 Criticism of Plato's ideas about Communism of Wives:

Plato's concept of communism of wives has faced severe criticism by various scholars. One of the greatest critics of Plato in this regard is his greatest disciple Aristotle.

Aristotle believes that moderation is better than extreme. Aristotle rejects extreme measures suggested by Plato. Family marriage and property are time tested institutions. They are part of human civilization. Since the time man started civilized life they exist. Ending of property, family and marriage will not be progressive step; it will be going back to stage when man was living a barbaric life. Family provides emotional security. Family is a means of primary socialization. Ending the system of marriage will create problem of morality. All children will become children of public and no one will take their responsibility. Hence there is no use in ending this useful institution.

In additions to the above criticism of Aristotle Plato's theory of communism of wives has been criticized by others on many other grounds.

First, the relations between husband and wife are not merely mating relations. They are highly spiritual relations. The concept of temporary marriage is neither logical nor desirable. Similarly the relationship between the child and the mother is one of affection and it can't be treated as Plato wanted to treat it.

2nd Barker has said, "Plato Makes the individual a mere means and that in respect of a side of life in which he most naturally claims to be end to himself." In such a personal

matter as marriage and sexual intercourse an individual can never like to be only a means to an end.
3rd The abolition of the institution of family is likely to give serious setback to the sentiments like love, charity, generosity and mercy.
4th Plato in the support of his communism of wives draws analogies from the animal world. It is not reasonable to reduce human beings to animals for the realization of a supposed good.
5th, Family gives affection to children and also helps to developing social etiquettes etc. It looks after the children when care is most needed. By abolishing this institution he shall be doing more harm than good to the society.

6th Family is an age old institution and with the passage of time it has proved its utility. The women always have sentimental value for the children, for their husband and for all nears and dears. It will be great injustice to this intuition by introducing system of communism of wives.

1.4.7 Conclusion:

Despite the above criticism of Plato's theory of communism of wives we can't deny that Plato seems to be quit logical in emphasizing that the state could not get undivided loyalty unless the institution of family was done away with it. But it is quite unfortunate that the logical conclusions to which he has tried to draw from his theory have not proved very correct. His explanation of the theory has made his very basic theory unrealistic and devoid of hard realities of life. However one must appreciate Plato's political insight into basic causes of the disunity and friction in the state which he finds in the combination of economic power with political power. On the other hand it is also can't be denied that many a times family affection involves a person in corruption. Plato's objective of this philosophy is good but the means is not acceptable at all.

1.4.8 Comparison of Plato's Communism with modern Communism:

Before making a comparison between Plato's communism and modern communism it is desirable to understand the meaning of the modern communism. Modern communism is expounded by Karl Marx and modified by Lenin and Stalin. It is emerged as a criticism of capitalism and the central idea is abolition of private property. It considers state as an instrument of exploitation and holds that the class struggle will culminate in the overthrow of the present capitalist system and establishment of dictatorship of proletariat. In course of time the state shall wither away and a stateless and classless society shall emerge. In such society labour shall be valued and there will be dignity for work. Then rich will not exploit the poor and each one will have sufficient to meet his needs.

Similarities: There are a member of similarities between modern communism and Plato's communism.

(1) Both considered private property as an evil which needs to be abolished. Both give primary to collectivity over individual.
(2) Both hold that the individual interests can be best secured by promoting the general interest.
(3) Both believe in existence of classes.
(4) Both want to establish an ideal state in which there will be no economic struggle and each will get according to one's needs and necessities.

(5) Both want to eliminate the existing frictions and differences in the society and bring about unity and solidarity.
(6) Both relegate the individual to the position of an instrument for the promotion of the interest of the community.

Differences: Despite the above similarities there are many fundamental differences between the two.

(1) Plato's perspective is idealist where as Marxist perspective is materialistic.
(2) Plato believes in continuation of classes where as Marx believes in abolition of classes.
(3) Plato's communism is meant only for the guardian class and the vast majority of people consisting of peasants, workers, artisans etc did not come under its purview. On the other hand the modern communism is for entire society.
(4) In Plato the basis of class is spiritual i.e it depends upon dominant element in soul while for Marx basis of class is economic . It is related to ownership of means of production.
(5) Plato's communism is essentially political in nature and aims at unity of the state; on the other hand the modern communism is primarily economic in nature.
(6) Plato's communism covered not only property but also wives. The modern communism on the other hand deals only with the property and instruments of production.
(7) Plato's communism is aristocratic in nature. It is for the guardian classes. The working classes have no place in his arrangements. Whereas modern communism is primarily for the proletariats.
(8) Plato's communism was essentially meant for the Greek city states; On the other hand the modern communism is not only concerned with national states. It is rather a worldwide movement.
(9) Plato believed that education is a means to achieve communism; where Marx believed in violent revolution.
(10) Plato's communism was highly philosophical and could never be put into actual practice. On the other hand the modern communism is highly practical philosophy and has already been come into practice in many countries.

In conclusion it can be said though there are some similarities between Plato's communism and Modern Communism; there are fundamental differences between the two. It would be unfair to compare the two. However Barker calls Plato's communism as half communism as it applies only to a small fraction of the total population.

Check your progress: 3

A. Plato calls for communism of wives and property for which section of the society?

B. What is the basic concern for Plato behind providing system of communism?

1.5. Theory of Philosopher King:

Philosopher king is the political component of ideal state of Plato. Philosopher king differs from amateur rules. He has a theoretical as well as practical knowledge about the art of statesmanship. He is not an ordinary person. He is a symbol of knowledge and sacrifice. He is a product of long system of education. According to Plato an ideal state must be governed by philosopher king who should be a passionless person and seeker of truth and wisdom.

Plato believed that one of the major causes of the prevailing turmoil was the rule of ignorance. So the remedy is rule of knowledge. Plato said "Until philosopher are kings or kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy… cities will never rest from their evils. Plato believed that philosopher king is personification of knowledge and knowledge is virtue. So the state ruled by philosopher king is virtuous. The rule of philosopher king is according to principle of justice. Justice demands reason should be at the top and reason should govern coverage and appetite. Hence Plato talked of Philosopher king who is full of wisdom and reason.

1.5.1 Features of Plato's Rule of Philosopher king:

Plato's conception of rule by the philosopher king has some distinct features. These are –

(1) Plato's philosopher king is one who is the lover of wisdom. He is a passionate seeker after truth. He knows everything by virtue of his knowledge. Because of his intellectual brilliance he has better capacity to judge the things than any other ordinary person. He can look after the interests of community better than those who are ignorant.

(2) Plato's philosopher rules are the product of comprehensive and rigorous training and education, spread over a period of thirty five years. In fact the system is so extensive and exhaustive that it continues for the whole life of the philosopher king.

(3) Plato basically has tried to establish intellectual aristocracy. He wants to have government of the elite when he says that all are not competent to rule. He argued that as all persons residing in a state not possess equal capacity to cultivate virtue, hence all were not entitled to participate in the affairs of the government.

(4) The interest of the philosopher king and those of the state are identical and there is no clash between the two. In fact the philosophers have no interests apart from the welfare of the members of the community. The element of reason which is present in them enables them to distinguish his own as well as state interests. In other words the philosophers possess the qualities of selfless service and rationality.

(5) The rule of philosopher king is absolute in nature. He is not accountable to public opinion or bound by customs or written laws. According to Plato since the philosopher rulers are the embodiment of virtue and knowledge. There is no logic for public control over their actions. Philosopher rulers know it well what is good or bad for the community, there is no need to bind them with the rules of laws.

(6) Through the philosopher rulers are assigned absolute powers, Plato imposes a restraint on their power by insisting that they must respect the fundamental articles of the constitution and must not change the basic principles on which the state rests.

Some of the basic principles which the philosopher rulers are expected to observe are –

(1) Philosopher king must watch against the excessive inflow of property and wealth in the state.

(2) Philosopher king should cheek that the size of state remains consistent with the principle of self sufficiency.

(3) Philosopher king has to maintain principal of justice i.e. principle of functional representation.
(4) He has to maintain the system of education proposed by Plato.
(5) Thus philosopher king is not limited by public opinion, but he is limited by the basic structures of constitution of republic.

1.5.2 Evaluation of Plato's Theory of Philosopher King:

Plato's philosophy about philosopher king and role of philosophy has been put to severe criticism on the following grounds-

(1) Plato's conception of philosopher rulers leads to tyrannical government which runs counter to the notion of democratic government.
(2) It is a utopian idea because it is not possible to find out a philosopher king.
(3) There is a possibility of misuse of power by philosopher king. It is a well known fact that power corrupts. There is no guarantee that rule of philosopher king will not degenerate.
(4) Plato's theory of philosopher ruler is elitist in nature. It supports the principle of in-equality.
(5) The scheme of education outlined by Plato for his Philosopher ruler is highly defective. He thinks that the study of music, abstract mathematics, dialects and the idea of the Good would be sufficient to produce an efficient philosopher king. But he does not provide for the study of essential subjects like law, finance and so on which is very much essential for a good ruler.
(6) A philosopher king can at any stage also think of combining his own interests with public interests and thus may try to have unlimited powers and make the lives of citizens miserable. In his scheme of things there is no provision for checking his selfishness.

1.5.3 Conclusion:

Despite the above criticism of his concept of rule of philosopher king, it cannot be denied that this concept is the most profoundly original conception in the entire political thought. He rightly preached that all could not be competent to rule and that only few who had cultivated mind and brain were competent to rule. Again Plato linked education with good governance. He also established that philosophy is not the personal enterprise, it should serve the humanity and good ruler not simply protects but also create conditions for upliftment of the people. The only defect with his philosophy is that he failed to provide practical training to his philosopher rulers. In short he raised an unsound and impracticable super structure over a sound philosophy.

Check your progress: 4

A. Who is Philosopher king according to Plato?

1.6.0 Plato's Ideal State:

Plato in his republic portrays the picture of an ideal state which is more or less utopian. According to him the citizens can be at their best only in an ideal state and hopes that by establishing an ideal state all the evil of the society can be eliminated. Plato wanted to realize the idea of the Good in his ideal state. He wanted to set a pattern as to what a state should be. Plato's ideal state was meant to be the state as such, a type or model for all places and all times. However Plato did not care whether that was practicable or not. In the words of Sabine, "The general nature of the state as a kind or type is the subject of the book, and it is a secondary question whether actual state lives up to the model or not." Plato wanted to lay down standards or principals

which the state ought to follow under all circumstances and become ultimate goals and objectives which it should struggle to achieve. His ideal state was not bound by any customs and conventions but a romance of free intelligence. It was superiority of virtue which mattered much in the administration of the state. If the wise and the virtuous rule the state there can be no doubt that an ideal state can be achieved. As in the case of human beings that reason and sprit dominate appetite so is the case with the state. In a ideal state only a few reasonable shall rule. Plato has thus given an aristocratic outlook to the state. He was of the view that such an arrangement is logical and natural in which the wise few shall have a right to rule over the ignorant who are always in vast majority.

According to Plato like human soul the state also has these elements which gives birth three classes – economic class, military class and ruling class, each performing a special or appointed functions. It means in his ideal state there shall be functional specialization. The economic class is concerned with the production of wealth and was said to be composed of men having iron in their nature. The warrior class composed of persons who defended the community and was said to be composed of persons having silver in their nature. The ruling class was responsible for the government of the country and has gold in their nature. Though each class was important within its respective sphere Plato considered the ruling class more important than other three classes, because the responsibility for the making of the state rested on this class. He therefore, tried to raise a ruling class bereft of selfishness through proper training and communism of property and wives.

1.6.1 Features of Plato's ideal State:

1. Rule of philosopher king: According to Plato an ideal state must be governed by a philosopher king who is embodiments of perfect knowledge, reason personified. The Philosopher rulers are above passion and prejudice. They represent virtue in action. By their actions they should command respect from all. They are not to be bound by any law, custom or public opinion. Such rulers alone could be in a position to look after the welfare of all. The proposition that the philosophers who possess knowledge should rule as a right, is the central point of the whole scheme of Plato's ideal state.
2. State controlled education system: According to Plato state should have full control over education. For him it was the only agency which could produce philosopher kings and train the minds and thoughts of the people in right and proper direction. In his philosophy education had both social and individual aspects. In society, education should promote social welfare while individually it should bring soul closer to reality.
3. Functional Specialization: In Plato's ideal state there was functional specialization. Every person performed only those functions for which he was fitted and got training in order to perform his functions efficiently. Plato did not like that each and everybody should go on performing functions of the type which were not suited to his temperament and taste.
4. Equal treatment of men and women: In Plato's ideal state women are given equal status with men. According to Plato both should be brought up as useful citizens, as both are an integral part of the state and as such there should be no distinction between the two in so far as development of their faculties is concerned.

5. Communism of wives and property: Plato believed that if the ruling class was to perform its duties devotedly and honestly it was essential that there should be communism of wives and property. In other word Plato talked of communism of wives and property in his ideal state to the guardian class to make them free from the bondage of family life and worries and narrow family interest so that they can devote themselves to the work of the state. Without such a communism there was every possibility of their becoming corrupt and selfish.
6. Totalitarian outlook: Plato's ideal state has totalitarian outlook. According to Plato people can only develop in the state and that was the only agency through which his personality could find the fullest expression. The people should not think in terms other than merging themselves in the state. None can either be above or aside the state but was an integral part of the state. Since the philosopher king ruled the state and he was above individual or party considerations, there was no need to fear or think in terms of protecting one's own interests. It should be left entirely to the state to look after the welfare of the people living in.
7. Restriction of Art and literature: According to Plato in the ideal state there should be positive restrictions on the production of art and literature. In such a state no cheap unpopular or immoral literature should come before the people.
8. Spirit of Justice: According to Plato justice is an essential and integral part of a state. In Plato's ideal state there prevails the spirit of justice. Justice according to Plato means the due performance by each individual of the functions for which he is best fitted by aptitude and training. No individual should interface in other's sphere.
9. Retention of Slavery: Plato believed that in an ideal state, it was essential that the ruling class should have sufficient leisure, because without it the rulers shall not be in a position to devote their time for the development of the people. It was therefore most essential that the slavery should be retained and the slaves should be given physical work so that the ruling classes could devote their time for leisure. In fact, for him slavery system was an integral part of his ideal state.

1.6.2 Criticism of ideal State:

Plato's concept of ideal state has been criticized on various grounds. Some such criticisms are

(1) Utopian concept: The ideal state propounded by Plato is more or less utopian. It is neither possible nor practicable.
(2) Anti human state: Plato has tried to portray a state which is against the human nature. Communism of wives and property is against human sentiments and feelings.
(3) Denial of education to the lower class: Plato denied higher education to lower classes and thus he has created a distinction between ruling and the working class. This is vitally injurious to the state and can result in the division of society into hostile camps. This can bound to do more harm than good to the society.

(4) Ignoring of Producing Classes: Plato has ignored the rule of working and producing class. The very idea of ignoring a particular class is undesirable and unwanted and does fall in line with the philosophy of perfect or an ideal state.
(5) Anti-Democratic: Plato's ideal state is anti democratic in nature and character. Because Plato has made it more or less compulsory for the citizens to obey the commands of the philosopher king. They have not been given any authority or power to defy his commands. He has not even put his philosopher king under the obedience of the law which may result in dangerous consequences. Again philosophy of ideal state does not believe in the equality of man.
(6) Perpetuating Slavery: Plato has not condemned the institution of slavery. Instead he has tried to perpetuate it. He has done his utmost to justify the continuance of this institution. Whatever may be the merits of this institution in his own philosophy but it cannot be accepted on any ground.
(7) Totalitarian in nature: Plato's ideal state is totalitarian in the sense that it completely merges the individual in the state and thus pays no regards to the individual. Plato has very badly under estimated the individual, common man and his role in the state.
(8) The rule of Philosopher king: Plato's ideal state is to ruled by philosopher king. But it is again unrealistic.

1.6.3 Conclusion:

Though there are certain criticism against Plato's theory of ideal state, we cannot say that this theory has no value at all. Most important contribution of this theory is that he has set fourth certain targets for the succeeding generations to strive for and to achieve those at the earliest. The core of his philosophy still remains unchanged. State controlled system of education is even today being introduced in many states. The education of the ruler, specialization of work, equal treatment for men and women, Importance of justice - all these have their importance in a state. Plato's stress on virtuous people is even today appreciated. He rather very correctly said and that is true as well even today that, 'The states do not come out of an oak or a rock but from the characters of men that dwelt therein and this being so he who wishes to study the characters of men will do well to study their states.' It is not the number of people who live in the state which matters, but what matters is number of virtuous people. If there are still certain defects in the basic theory, due consideration must be given to the times in which he was expounding that. His theory, in his own times and circumstances, was well suited and practicable as well as attainable though not in today's time……

Check your progress: 5

A. In which book Plato portrays the picture of an ideal state?
B. What is the main basis of Plato's Ideal State?

1.7.0 Suggested Readings:

(i) Arora, Prem and Brij Grover.Political Thought FromPlato to Marx. Cosmos Bookhive PVT LTD, Delhi
(ii) Mukherjee, Subrata and Susila Ramaswamy. A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
(iii) Varma, V.P. Modern Political Thought. Agra: Laxmi Narayan Aggarwal.
(iv) Bandari, D.R. History of Europian Political Philosophy. Bangalore: The Bangalore Printing and Publishing Company.

Possible answers to check your progress:

Check Your Progress: 1

A. Ans: Plato gives an unconventional theory of justice. The conventional theory of justice defines justice in the legal sense of the term and theories of justice are linked to theory of rights. Plato's theory is unconventional because Plato considers justice as individual virtue as well as virtue of social institutions. Secondly it is an unconventional theory because it talks about justice in trams of duties rather than in terms of rights.

B. Ans: Justice according to Plato is based on the principle of functional specialization. It means proper placement of all elements of a society.

Check Your Progress: 2

A. Ans: Education is very central in Platonic thought. The topic of education is dealt in very extensive manner in his book "Republic". This is the reason Rousseau called "Republic" the best treatise ever written on education

B. Ans: The main objective of Plato's theory of Education is to create Philosopher King.

Check Your Progress: 3

A. Ans: Plato calls for communism of wives and property for the guardian class only.

B. Ans: The basic concern for Plato behind providing system of communism is to tackle the problem of corruption.

Check Your Progress: 4

A. Ans: Philosopher king is the political component of ideal state of Plato. Philosopher king differs from amateur rules. He has a theoretical as well as practical knowledge about the art of statesmanship. He is not an ordinary person. He is a symbol of knowledge and sacrifice. He is a product of long system of education. According to Plato an ideal state must be governed by philosopher king who should be a passionless person and seeker of truth and wisdom.

Check Your Progress: 5

A. Ans: Plato in his book "Republic" portrays the picture of an ideal state.

B. Ans: The main basis of Ideal state is Justice.

References:

(i) Arora, Prem and Brij Grover.*Political Thought FromPlato to Marx*. Cosmos Bookhive PVT LTD, Delhi

(ii) Mukherjee, Subrata and Susila Ramaswamy. *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

(iii) Varma, V.P. *Modern Political Thought*. Agra: Laxmi Narayan Aggarwal.

(iv) Bandari, D.R. *History of Europian Political Philosophy.* Bangalore: The Bangalore Printing and Publishing Company.

Model questions:

1. Critically discuss Plato's theory of Justice.
2. Discuss Plato's theory of Education?
3. Discuss the basic features of Platonic system of Education.
4. Critically discuss Plato's scheme of Education
5. Critically Discuss Plato's theory of Communism? Distinguish between Plato's communism and Modern communism.
6. What are the basic reasons for communism of family according to Plao?
7. Who is a Philosopher king? What are the basic principles the Philosopher rulers expected to be observed?
8. Critically discuss Plato's rule of philosopher king.
9. Critically discuss Plato's theory of Ideal State.

UNIT-II
ARISTOTLE

Structure:

2.0 Objectives

After going through this unit you shall be able to:
Understand Aristotle's life time, influences, methods of study and works written by Aristotle.
Identify his conception on state, various types of Justice and the reasons for supporting the slavery system by Aristotle.
Describe his analysis on family, property and education system.
Explain why Aristotle is not giving citizenship to all the people.
Analyze the general and particular causes of revolution and its remedies.
Assess the contribution of Aristotle to the political thought.

2.1 Life and Time

Stagira, in 384 B.C. got the privilege of giving birth to this world famous political philosopher who was subsequently characterized as the father of Political Science. His birth place was on the Macedonian Coast, and thus he was not Athenian by birth. His father was a physician to the king of Macedon. This gave him an opportunity to acquire first- hand information about the royal court. It also gave him understanding of the working of the state. It helped Aristotle to develop an analytical and scientific bent of mind. He came to Athens at age of eighteen and joined Plato's academy where he stays for twenty years till the death of Plato in 347 B.C. In 342 B.C. he was called to Macedonia to become the tutor of young Alexander. After the death of Alexander he fled to Chalcis and died the same year.

2.2 Influences

Aristotle's philosophy reflects three main influences. First, the decline in the city-state which was giving place to the Imperial system even in his days had greatly agitated his mind. Second, he was deeply influenced by the current Greek prejudices and beliefs such as the essential superiority of the Greek over the barbarian and of the city-state over other forms of social organization, predominant role of the citizen in public life, usefulness of slavery and the priority of the state over the individual. The third major influence was that of his master Plato with whom he studied for 20 years.

2.3 Method of Study

Aristotle inherited from his father a keen sense of scientific inquiry in all matters of his interest. A comparison between Plato, the celebrated teacher and Aristotle, the equally celebrated disciple would show that the intellectual make-up and the reasoning process of the two are different.

a) Plato was pre-eminently a radical thinker. Aristotle was moderate and conservative in his political speculation.

b) Plato adopted the deductive method of reasoning. Aristotle followed the inductive method.

c) Plato started with abstract notions of justice and virtue to make these the guiding principles of his ideal state. Aristotle made a comparative study of the existing constitutions to discover the elements that go into the best constitution.

d) Plato planned his ideal state on the basis of certain assumed principles like the rule of philosophy, communism etc. regardless of practical difficulties.

Aristotle, on the other hand, tested his hypotheses by reference to the prevailing institutions.

e) Plato proceeded from the Universal or the ideal to the particular, while Aristotle went along from the particular and concrete to the Universal.
f) Plato believed that reality lay in the ideal while Aristotle thought that it lay in the concrete manifestation of a thing or object.
g) Aristotle regarded himself more as a systematiser of already existing knowledge that as a propounder of new philosophy like Plato. The reasoning of Aristotle is less imaginative and more logical and scientific than that of Plato, and his speculations and judgements are sounder than those of his master.
h) If Plato apriori or speculative method and started with certain fundamentals, Aristotle relied chiefly on the methods of observation, empiricism and comparison.
i) If Plato subordinated politics to ethics, Aristotle gave the pride of place to politics.

2.4 Works of Aristotle

Aristotle has written much. Some of his writings include Categories, Topics, On Sophistical Refutation, On the Heavens, On the Soul, Natural History, The Movements of Animals, The Generation of Animals, Rhetoric, Politics etc.

Check Your Progress-I

1. Mention the methods of study of Aristotle.
2. Name some books written by Aristotle.

2.5 Aristotle's theory on state

For Aristotle, as with Plato, the state (Polis) is all- important. The state with Aristotle began for the satisfaction of basic wants, but as it developed it came to perform more elevated aims essential for good life.

The characteristics of Aristotle's theory of state are given below-

1. According to Aristotle, the state is a natural organization. Unlike Plato's ideal state, Aristotle's state is not structured or manufactured , not a make but is a growth- growing gradually out of villages with-villages growing out of families, and the families, out of man's nature, his social instincts. The state grows like a tree.
2. The state is like a human organism. Aristotle is of the opinion that the state, like the human organism, has its own parts, i.e., the individuals. Apart from the state, he argues, the individuals have no importance, and separated from the body, the parts have not like of their own. The interest of the part of the body is inherent in the interest of the body- what separate interest a hand has when apart from the body likewise, the interest of the individuals is inherent in the interest of the state.
3. The state is a self-sufficing institution while the village and the family is not. The self- sufficient state is higher than the families and the villages- it is their union. As a member of the family the individuals become social.
4. The state is not only an association or union as Aristotle calls it, but is an association are not as large as is the state, they are specific, and therefore,

limited in their objectives and essence. The state, on the other hand, has general and common purposes, and therefore, has larger concerns as compared to any or other associations.

5. The state is not, Aristotle says, a unity which it is for Plato. Plato seeks to attain unity within the state. Aristotle too seeks to attain the unity, but for him, it is unity in diversity. For Aristotle, the state is not uniformity, but is one that brings all the diversities together.

   It is one

   i. which is a small city-state;
   ii. whose tertiary corresponds to the population it has;
   iii. that is geographically located near the river and where good climate condition exist.
   iv. where the rule of law prevails; and
   v. where authority/power is vested in the hands of the citizens.

On the basis of his study of 158 constitutions, Aristotle has given a classification which became a guide for all subsequent philosophers who ventured to classify governments. For him, the rule of one and for the interest of all is monarchy and its perverted form is tyranny if such a rule exists for the benefit of the ruler. The rule of the few and for the interest of all is aristocracy, and its perverted form is oligarchy if such few rule in their own interest. The rule of many and for the interest of all is polity, and its perverted form is democracy if such a rule exists for those who have the power. Aristotle too refers to the cycle of classification monarchy is followed by tyranny; tyranny by aristocracy, aristocracy by oligarchy; oligarchy by polity, polity by democracy; and democracy by monarchy and so goes on the cycle of classification.

Aristotle's classification has become outdated, for it cannot be applied to the existing system what he calls the classification of states is, infact, the classification of governments, for, like all, the ancient Greeks, he confuses between the state and government.

2.6 Aristotle's Theory of Justice

The Greek political thinkers attached great importance to the concept of justice. They felt that it was one of the most outstanding and important features of the state. It was virtue in action and worked on the basis of mutual cooperation in which each and every member of the society should try to discharge their duties towards the community as a whole. It was of general excellence and depicted moral development.

According to Plato, justice was in proper performance of duties. He felt that the philosophers, soldiers and the peasants, who had been allotted a particular job, should perform that properly and honesty. The philosophers should rule, soldiers fight and the peasants serve the community as a whole with devotion and honesty.

As regards Aristotle, justice was of two types, namely, (i) Complete or Absolute justice (ii) Particular justice. Complete or Absolute justice is virtue in action or excellence of character and it lies in conforming to law. According to him, particular justice was concerned with the distribution of offices and observance of rules of proportionate equality. It also consisted in proper and desirable distribution of wealth, honour and good things.

Corrective justice is mainly concerned with the issues arising from commercial transactions like sale, hire, furnishing of security etc. and few other things like aggression on property life, honour and freedom.

Distributive justice, on the other hand, means giving to all what is their demand according to their contribution to society in the form of wealth or virtue. It is mainly concerned with political rights. Every form of government has its own standard of distributive justice.

Further, offices and honours should not be restricted to only the virtuous few but should be open to all the citizens. People should collectively make important contribution to the state and proportionately rewarded. Aristotle believed in the collective wisdom of the people in electing and judging the magistrates. Every class has something to contribute and thereby entitles to itself to some share in political power. A state to be stable needs more supporters than enemies. He wanted to reconcile the principle of democracy with his philosophy of justice and thereby evolve a liberal constitution. But this concept of distributive justice of Aristotle cannot apply to modern big states as against the city-states of his time. Moreover, his notion of distributive justice is based on duties rather than rights. In modern justice power and honour are linked to merit.

2.7 Aristotle's Conception of Slavery

Aristotle believed it was essential that household should be properly maintained and for that the institutions of slavery was most essential. Aristotle considered slavery to be both natural and necessary. Slave is a living possession of family. A slave differs from his master because of differences in power of reasoning and understanding, the master having far superior reasoning power than the slave.

According to Aristotle slavery is not only useful to the master but also to the slaves. It is only by serving his master that the slaves is able to share the virtue of his master. Moreover, if the master's material worries are taken care by the slaves, they may be able to devote themselves to the public affairs.

Aristotle defended the institution of slavery on numerous grounds:

i. It is a fact of nature that the inferior is subordinate to the superior. A soul rules over the body, reason over appetite, similarly men of reason should rule over men who are wanting in reasoning and understanding. Hence the natural subjection of slaves to their masters.
ii. Slavery is necessary because it provides leisure to the citizens whose devotion to public duties leaves them no time for personal needs.
iii. The interest of the slave lies in his subordination to the master. He does not know his own interest.
iv. According to Aristotle it is wrong to believe that all are born equal. Inequality is a fact of nature. Those who possess wisdom are born to rule over those who do not have these. The nature has deliberately gifted them with these virtues. The superior must rule over the inferior.
v. In nature everybody and part of the body has a specific function to perform. This one part cannot perform the functions of another part. Similarly those who are physically superior cannot perform the duties of those who are intellectually superior and vice versa.
vi. Slavery is a social necessity besides being a family requirement. The relationship between the master and the slavery is complementary and not contradictory.

vii. Just as marriage between a man and a woman is natural, so is the tie between the master and the slave.

Criticism

Aristotle's defense of slavery has been criticized on many grounds.

1. Aristotle's justification of slavery is contrary to notions of human equality and brotherhood.
2. It is more or less impossible in actual practice to have a group of people who are born masters or a born slaves.
3. In modern days retention of this institution is most unwanted and opposed to the very idea of equality.
4. His theory of slavery is contrary to modern notion of social justice which inevitably addresses itself to different forms of disadvantages and discriminations.

Conclusion

A slave, according to Aristotle, is not a human being. He is sub-human, incomplete, and a barbarian. However, he is an animate, a means for action and not intended for production, for he helps in the business within the household. He belongs to the master, but Aristotle rejects inhumane treatment of slaves, and advocates their emancipation as a reward for their good behavior. Aristotle had emancipated his slaves a year before his death.

Check your Progress- II

1. Explain the Aristotle's concept on state.
2. Why Aristotle support slavery system? Give reasons for your answer.

2.8 Aristotle's Conceptions on Family

Unlike Plato, Aristotle considered family to be a natural association of which man becomes a member from very birth. It is as natural as the state. Aristotle believed that family is one institution where an individual is born, is nurtured, gets his identity, his name and above all attains intellectual development. He asserts that family is the primary school of social virtue where a child gets lesson of qualities such as cooperation, love, tolerance, and sacrifice. It is not merely a primary association, but is a necessary unit of society. If man is a social animal which Aristotle insists he is, family becomes the extension of man's nature; the village, the extension of families; and the state, an extension and union of families and villages.

A family, Aristotle says, consists of husband, wife, children, slaves and property. It involves three types of relationships that of the master and slave, marital (between the husband and wife), and parental (between the father and the child). The master, Aristotle held, rules the slave; the husband rules the wife (Aristotle regards woman inferior to man), and the father rules the son.

Aristotle viewed that family is the very unit, which makes up ultimately, the state- from man to family, families to village, from villages to the state. This is how the natural growth of the state takes place.

2.9 Aristotle's Conception on Private Property

Aristotle supported the private property. Aristotle said that for the existence and proper functioning of the household private property is necessary. Aristotle's

theory of property is based on his criticism of Plato's communism of property. Plato thought of property as an obstacle in the proper functioning of the state and, therefore suggested communism for the guardian class. But for Aristotle, property provided psychological satisfaction by fulfilling the human instinct for possession and ownership. The Instinet for acquiring property in man is natural. But the amount of property required by the family limited by its needs.

Aristotle justified private property on the following grounds:

i. The instinct for acquiring property is the nature's gift to man.
ii. Property is necessary for the existence and proper functioning of the household.
iii. Private property is essential for leading good life. It also promotes the development of individual personality.
iv. The ownership o property is a source of pleasure. According to Aristotle, "Almost all men love money".
v. The possession of private property creates a sense of civic responsibility in the owner.
vi. Private property makes the man know the art of managing it and the experience thus gained will also be useful in the management of public affairs.
vii. Private property which is motivated by self interest will also promote social interest. When the individual will do his best in self- interest, his efforts will also benefit society.

With regard to the ownership of property, Aristotle referred to:

a. individual ownership, and individual use, which is, for Aristotle, the most dangerous situation,
b. common ownership, and individual use, a situation that begins with socialism, but ends in capitalism- it is also not acceptable;
c. common ownership and common use, a devise invariably impracticable;
d. individual ownership and common use, a devise generally possible and equally acceptable.

Aristotle said that property should be private but use of it is common. So he viewed that private property is essential and, therefore, is justified, but it has to be acquired through honest means.

2.10 Aristotle's Theory of Education

Aristotle drew attention to the pivotal role of education in ordering good life for the citizens as well as the city. The laws of the city are of no avail unless the citizen is moulded in the culture of the constitution. It is only then that the laws are best appreciated and effectively implemented. Education alone can train men not only to hold property but also to use it as a public trust. The state should primary responsibility for regulating education in the best interests of the citizen and the city. Aristotle viewed that state should control the education system. Aristotle divided the education system into three stages. First stage is from birth to 7 years, second stage, 8 years to 14 years. Third stage is from 14 years to 21 years.

Education must begin from birth to the age of 7 and continue in stages from 8 to 14. In the third stage from 14 to 21 the citizen ceases to belong to himself or his family along but that he belongs to the state. He has therefore to be adopted to the constitution of the city. Special emphasis should be given to reading and writing, drawing, gymnastics and music. Reading and writing are useful in practical life.

Gymnastics promotes courage and music facilitates enjoyment of leisure. Aristotle laid special emphasis on music which, according to him, is the pivot of education. It is not only a source of entertainment and relaxation but it serves also as a means of moral training. Aristotle would also equate music with goodness by saying that music brings delight and delight is caused by goodness and therefore music is goodness.

In conclusion, education bring the source of all knowledge and goodness should be state controlled and must cover whole life and all its aspects action and leisure and matters of war and peace. In the ultimate analysis, education produces virtue without which man is the "most unholy and savage of animals, full of gluttony and lust".

Check Your Progress- III

1. Why Aristotle give importance on property?
2. Write a brief note on education system of Aristotle.
3. Give two points in support of Aristotle's conception on family.

2.11 Aristotle's Conception on Citizenship

Aristotle said that citizen is one of the important characteristics of the state. Aristotle's views on citizenship are coloured by his conservative stance. He wanted to rationalize the situation in Athens and was opposed to radical transformation.

Citizens in the "polis' were privileged class of people who enjoyed complete monopoly in political affairs. Property was an important qualification for being a citizen. It is based on heredity. The bulk of the population comprising the slaves, women and aliens were debarred for citizenship status.

2.11.1 Who is a Citizen?

According to Aristotle, a citizen is a person who participates in the administration of justice and in legislation as a member of the deliberative assembly. A person cannot claim status of citizenship exclusively on following grounds:

a. Residence in a particular place
b. Enjoyment on legal rights
c. Descent from a citizen.

2.11.2 Criteria for Citizenship

The above three aspects could be considered for citizenship only if a person participates in administration of justice and legislation. In other words, a citizen must possess the essential attribute of ruling and being ruled, at the same time. In his scheme, "leisure remains an essential condition of citizenship because without it none can cultivate virtue and devote themselves to the affairs of the state.

Aristotle excludes women, old people and children from the category of citizens because they are intellectually inferior; physically unfit and politically immature.

2.11.3 Plato and Aristotle compared:

Both Plato and Aristotle were not very liberal in conferring citizenship rights. They wished that only a few should enjoy this right and excluded not only the aliens and the traders but also the women, the children, the old persons and slave in addition to the artisans and all others doing menial and the manual labour. But in spite of all this palto's concept is more democratic and he is more liberal as compared with

Aristotle, in so far as concept of citizenship is concerned. Plato conferred this right on producing class which was denied by Aristotle. Plato also did not adopt as aristocratic an attitude as adopted by Aristotle, that laboring class was simply instrumental in the hands of leisured class for its advancement.

2.11.4 Criticism

1. Property qualification is exaggerated so as to neglect the poor and working class.
2. His conception on citizenship is contrary to modern motion of democracy premised on political equality.
3. By depriving a large number of people from citizenship rights, the state is bound to have divided loyalties and those who are denied the right are bound to be less interested in state affairs than others.
4. Aristotelian citizenship is extremely limited to privileged few.
5. By making leisure an essential criterion for citizenship, he neglects the manual working class people.

Despite several shortcomings, one cannot deny that it was a first systematic effort to outline a scheme for establishing a relationship between the political community and its members. He offered a theory of citizenship which was primarily intended for the city state.

2.11.5 Aristotle's conception on Revolution

Aristotle discusses the concept of revolution in his famous book 'The Politics'. Aristotle has not used the term 'revolution' in a much broader sense than the way it is understood in modern times, namely, a mass upsurge and a total change in the form of state and to an extent of society, usually accompanied by violence. He uses the term to mean any kind of change, disturbance or disruption to the structure and functioning of state and society, no matter whether it is violent or non-violent, complete or incomplete, personal or impersonal. It may mean a change in the form of state or government, it may mean merely replacement of one set of rules by another or it may mean a change in the same form of government making it more so or less so, such as more of oligarchy or democracy. In short, any action which disturbs the equilibrium and causes disarray in the functioning of the social and political order is described by Aristotle as 'revolution'.

Aristotle attempts a detailed analysis of the causes of revolution which can be broadly classified as

1. general causes
2. revolutions in a particular kind of state

General causes of revolution include the desire of the people to be treated as equal. The states which are marked by greater extent of equality will be more stable. Thus, to Aristotle, lesser the inequality lesser will be chances of revolution. The general causes of revolution, in Aristotle's view is mentioned below-

1. Injustice and ill-will: According to Aristotle one of the major causes of revolution is injustice and ill-will on the part of those who are in power in the state towards their people. Thus where there is discontentment among a substantial section of the society against injustice or denial of justice, there can be the possibility of revolution.
2. Inequal distribution of offices: Another cause for revolution can be inequal, irrational and partial distribution of offices in which a particular

class of people is favoured with honours at the cost of the others, because such an attitude is bound to create dissatisfaction among those who are denied this privilege.

3. Misuse of authority: Then another reason can be the desire to take revenge from those not in power and to misuse of authority by those in power, thereby to disgraced, under-estimates and defame the opponents who are bound to take revenge at the appropriate time. In other words it can be said that political corruption can lead to revolution.
4. Careless officers and unwanted expenditure: Careless recruitment of corrupt and disloyal officers in army or civil offices and their desire to earn money by legal or illegal methods can result in revolution, specially when it is followed by disproportionate expenditure on some items or in the interest of a particular section of a society. In such cases the changes of revolution still more increase.
5. Neglecting minor affairs: Sometimes when minor affairs are neglected these can assume improportionately high magnitude with the passage of time and can also load to revolution. A minor affairs of today can become an explosive issue of tomorrow.

Aristotle also diagnoses the revolution in particular kind of state and outlines remedies to check them:

Form of Government	**Causes of Revolution**	**Means to Prevent Revolutions**
Democracy	- Excessive use of power	- allowing rich to participate in the administration
	- unwarranted condemnation of rich by the poor	
Oligarchy	- Rivalry among the ruling oligarchs themselves	- Fair treatment of the poor. - prohibiting individual or group to wield too much power
Aristocracy polity	- Conferring honour only to a few	- Same as above
	- Defective balance of different element in the constitution	- By mixing oligarchic and democratic means
Monarchy	- Oppressive rule	- Espionage system - Intellectual and material development
Tyranny	- Interference of foreign state	- Creating an awe in minds of people - Expansion of territory

2.11.6 Methods of Preventing the Revolution

According to Aristotle, revolutions can also be checked and prevented if proper, adequate and timely steps are taken in this direction. His study of subject is again based on his deductive method and penetrating insight of the problem. With

great care he studied the methods of checking the revolutions which he felt could be based on general as well as particular principles.

General Principles for the Prevention of Revolution

i. By gaining confidence of the people: As far as possible the people should be taken into confidence on all important matters so that they do not feel that the government and the masses are two separate entities working at cross purposes. This should particularly be done with regard to national income and expenditure. The people should be made sure that their officials are not utilizing their hard earned money for their personal interests but that the amount is being utilized for collective welfare. Thus the people should be ensured that the money collected is being used for their welfare.

ii. Proper selection of people for offices: The people should be assured and an atmosphere created in which they should feel that public offices are not being bestowed on a particular section of the society. They should also feel that all are co-sharers in the state honors and that it is not the monopoly few privileged to hold high offices. In fact state offices should be distributed on merit only and it should be ensured that all are benefited by such a distribution system.

iii. Checks on exercise of authority: No group or individual should be allowed to grow very powerful and to the extent that either he stands on the progress of others hinders the development of comparatively weaker sections society.

iv. Outsiders should be avoided: No outsider or a stranger should be given very high and responsible post in the state because he cannot have as much interest in the welfare of the state as the citizens or the people of the state can have.

v. No sudden promotion: Promotion to political posts should be slow .and as far as possible sudden promotions should be avoided. Sudden promotions result in disadvantage rather than any advantage to the society. These create jealousies and at times even the people promoted are not prepared to shoulder higher responsibilities.

vi. Proper education of the people: The people should be educated in the spirit of the constitution so that they develop their ideas in keeping with the constitution of the state and there is no possibility of any conflict.

2.12 Conclusion

The specificity with which Aristotle deals with the causes and remedies of revolution illustrates the political insight of the theorist. This remains one of the greatest contributions of Aristotle in the realm of political science. Where political realism is at its high water mark.

Check your Progress- IV

1. Examine the causes of revolution according to Aristotle.
2. Why Aristotle is not in favour of giving citizenship right to women?

2.13 Contribution of Aristotle

Aristotle, one of the great disciples of Plato has been hailed as father of political science. His ideas on politics, viz., social nature of man, rule of law, revolution, citizenship and constitutionalism have remained a matter of considerable significance to political scientists. For, he made the first systematic attempt to base his conclusions on facts, figures and data.

The contribution of Aristotle can be studied under following heads.

1. Comparative Method: Though the comparative approach to politics is of recent origin, it was greatness of Aristotle to use it to study 158 constitutions..
2. Primacy of Law: According to Prof. Ebenstein, "The concept of rule of law and the constructional state is perhaps the most important legacy. Aristotle has bequeathed to posterity". The significance of impersonal nature of law and its efficacy to resolve political conflicts is as pragmatic as ever. In this aspect he greatly influenced Aquinas, Hooker and Locke.
3. Theory of Origin of State : Aristotle dictum that "Man is a political animal" and his view of natural origin of state have been widely acclaimed to be scientific.
4. Positive Functions of the State : By saying "state exists not only for the sake of life but also for the sake of good life", Aristotle wants the state to take care of material as well as moral development of individual. Such view is novel in the sense that even in today's world states are entrusted with almost the same task.
5. Conservative Thinker : Aristotle's favour for retaining the existing institutions continues to influence conservatives.
6. Role of Middle Class: Aristotle's analysis of role of the middle class in sustaining political issues in contemporary period.
7. Private Property: Aristotle's plea for private ownership but common use has come to be accepted as most viable solution to problem of social justice.
8. Autonomy of Politic: Aristotle remains the first to make an attempt to separate politic from ethics by use of scientific methods to analyze political issue.

2.14 Let Us Sum Up

Unlike his master and predecessors, Aristotle engaged himself in analyzing a wide variety of political issues. What was more significant was his use of scientific method. Perhaps this explains the reason why he is hailed as more pragmatic political scientist.

2.15 Suggested Readings:

1. Great Political thinkers (East and West)- R.C. Gupta.
2. A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx- Subrata Mukherjee and Sushila Ramaswami.
3. History of Political Thought- P.G. Das.
4. Political Thought (Ancient and Medieval)- Dr. J.C. Johari.
5. A History of Political Thought- V.V. Rao.

Model questions:

1. Discuss Aristotle's arguments in support of slavery.
2. Examine Aristotle's views about family.
3. Critically examine the views of Aristotle on Revolution.
4. Analyse Aristotle's view about property.
5. Critically discuss Aristotle's ideas on citizenship.
6. Discuss Aristotle's conception on state.

BLOCK 2
UNIT – I:
ST. AUGUSTINE AND ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

STRUCTURE:

1.0 OBJECTIVE

This unit is concerned with two medieval political thinkers St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. After going through this unit you will be able to:

- Understand the political philosophy of St. Augustine.
- Explain how Augustine defended Christianity.
- Define philosophy of history as depicted by St. Augustine.
- Describe Augustine's view of man as a citizen of two cities.
- Distinguish between earthly state and city of God.
- Assess the contribution of St. Augustine towards political philosophy.
- Define St. Thomas Aquinas's concept of state and government.
- Highlight Aquinas's views on supremacy of church.
- Understand Aquinas's philosophy of law.
- Point out the contribution of Aquinas towards political philosophy.

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Dear learners, in the Block I you have learnt about classical Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle, who contributed a lot towards political philosophy through their systematic writings. As Barker stated "Political thought begins with the Greeks. Its origin is connected with the calm and clear rationalisation of Greek mind." The medieval thinkers are very much indebted to the writings of Plato and Aristotle. In this unit an attempt has been made to make you understand about the medieval thinkers St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas who linked religion to state. In the declining years of Roman civilization St. Augustine became a major political theorist. His fame rests on his work 'The City of God', which effectively answered the attacks on the Christian faith. Augustine imbibed, reinterpreted and transformed the entire Greek-Roman philosophical tradition of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and Plotinus and strengthened theology and metaphysics. He left behind a profound body of knowledge and religious faith as a rich legacy to European civilisation. In political thought he represented a turning point. Augustine introduced the Christian idea of the dual nature of man consisting of both a body and soul and insisted that both these elements must be given due importance in any political organisation. To Augustine, there is a divine life above and beyond the earthly or material life of man and the church is the institution which performs the function of looking after this aspect of life.

While the greatest contribution of St. Thomas Aquinas was linking Greek thought to Christianity, he made Aristotle the cornerstone of his philosophy. He also freely borrowed from the writing of Stoics, Cicero and other Roman lawyers. In subordinating state to church, he followed St. Augustine. From John of Salisbury, Aquinas borrowed the idea of supremacy of law and synthesised all branches of knowledge and attempted to reconcile faith and reason. He followed Aristotle's philosophy that the state is natural to man. He tried to represent Aristotle's philosophy by adjusting Christian doctrine and harmonising the both. But Aquinas was not a blind follower of Aristotle. The former differed from the latter when his doctrines clashed with those of Christianity. Aquinas followed Aristotle because he felt that his ideas were based on reason and proved sound logically. Aristotle's philosophy so much appealed to him that he has been characterised as Christianized Aristotle.

1.2 SAINT AUGUSTINE

Saint Augustine (13 November 354 A.D. – 28 August 430 A.D.) was an early Christian theologian and philosopher who influenced the development

of Western Christianity and Western philosophy. Augustine was the son of a pagan father and Christian mother. He was the Bishop of Hippo in North Africa converted to Christianity by St. Ambrose of Milan. Augustine has been regarded as one of the most important figures and Church Fathers in the history of the Christian Church and Western Christianity for his writings. Among his most important works are *The City of God* and *Confessions.* The period of Augustine is often called as the formative period of Christian thought. It was a period of transition from the ancient to the medieval age. It is said that medievalism began with St. Augustine.

Europe had gained religious unity after the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire. The Church and the state were not hostile to each other. However, the barbarian attacks brought ruin for the empire of Rome. Its fall caused great disturbance and confusion in the minds of conservative Christians and many others like pagans. They linked the spread of Christianity to the fall of Roman Empire. They pointed out that so long as the Romans worshipped the old gods of city-state like Jupiter, Neptune, Iris etc., success followed in their footsteps. Rome grew from a city-state to great world empire. They argued that when Romans abandoned the old gods and adopted Christianity, Rome faced its ruin. Thus, Christianity was a source of universal misery, according to the critics. The Christians themselves started to think that their faith and religion could not save Rome from its disaster. Besides the fate of the Empire, the state of affairs in the church was also a cause of anxiety in the minds of conservative Christians. Therefore, many schisms appeared within it. The unity and solidarity of Christianity started to disappear. Heresy or dissension was rampant within the religion. New sects sprang up, especially in North Africa.

1.2.1 Defence of Christianity

In such a situation St. Augustine was born at Numidia province of North Africa under the Roman Empire. Among the Christian religious philosophers, Augustine was a versatile scholar whose writings deeply influenced the political and spiritual thinking of Europe. Augustine took up the defence of Christianity by explaining the cause of the fall of Rome. He enquired the cause of dissension in Christianity and used his philosophical genius to strengthen the church and for the depiction of its ideals. The political philosophy of St. Augustine is contained in his book *'De Civitate Dei'* popularly known as 'The City of God.' It took him about 15 years to finish this work. It is divided into 22 books. The first ten books deal with the defence of Christianity from pagan attacks. The remaining twelve books are concerned with the construction of the city of God. St. Augustine explained the cause of writing of his book as "Rome, having been stormed and sacked by the Goths ...... the pagans made an attempt to attribute the calamity to the Christian religion... It was this which kindled my zeal for the name of God and prompted me to undertake the defence of the city of God against its assailants." Augustine's views on state and spirituality were reflected in the book. According to Augustine, man is a citizen of two cities namely the city of his birth and the city of God. This is because man's nature is two-fold. He is both spirit and body. The earthly city is founded due to the impulses of lower human nature. The city of God is founded in the hope of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. Those earthly states that accept Christianity came nearer to the city of God, which will finally emerge victorious. One can become member of city of God only after accepting the membership of the church. The city of God is nothing but a Christianity church state.

1.2.2 Philosophy of History from Christian point of view

Christianity has been recognised officially in the Roman Empire from 313 A.D. and eighty years later it became the state religion of the Empire. But fall of Rome occurred soon after it became state religion. Many pagans and other critics saw a connection between the rise of Christianity and the fall of Rome. The critics charged the nature of Christianity for its other worldliness, and disregard for public affairs and contempt for revered national deities. The Christian refusal to recognise loyalty to Rome and insistence on loyalty to the Church as the highest led to fall of Rome. When Rome was ravaged in 410, a wave of shock and horror swept through the world. For long eight centuries Rome was a centre of a vast and mighty empire. But when the Empire was broken up so easily by the invaders, everyone was surprised. Even Christians were perplexed. Everyone was shocked how Rome could be so shamed just after Christianity had become the religion of the state. St. Augustine took up the challenge on behalf of Christianity. In the process of answering the charge, Augustine developed a philosophy of history from the Christian point of view and explained the fall of Rome in the perspective of that viewpoint.

According to St. Augustine, the human race is a single family whose final destiny is reached in heaven. Human life is a theatre of struggle between the goodness of God and the evil of rebellious spirits. To Augustine, "All human history is the majestic unfolding of the plan of divine salvation in which the appearance of the church marks the decisive moment." Henceforth the unity of the race means the unity of the Christian faith under the leadership of the church. The state must become the secular arm of the church. Under the new dispensation the state must be a Christian state serving a community. By virtue of a common Christian faith the state administers life in which spiritual interests stood above all others. It contributes to human salvation by preserving the purity of the faith. A true commonwealth must be Christian. Only such a commonwealth could be truly just and render to everyone his own by teaching belief in the true religion. The Christian character of the state came to be embedded in the universally admitted principle. Its purpose is to realise justice and right. In some fashion or other the state is bound to be also a church. It must be dominated by the contest of two societies, the earthly society based upon the earthly, appetitive and possessive impulses of the lower human nature and the Heavenly Society, the City of God, founded in the hope of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. History becomes the dramatic story of the struggle between the two antagonistic societies and of the ultimate mastery which must fall to the City of God. Only in the Heavenly City, peace is possible; only the spiritual kingdom is permanent. Earthly kingdoms must pass away, for the earthly power is naturally mutable and unstable, being built upon those aspects of human nature which necessarily issue in war and the greed of domination.

1.2.3 Man as a Citizen of two Cities

According to Augustine, man is a citizen of two cities, namely the city of his birth and the city of God. One is the Divine State and the other is the earthly state. This is because man's nature is two-fold. He is both spirit and body. The earthly city is founded due to the impulses of lower human nature. This is the kingdom of Satan, '*Civitas Terrana'*. The earthly state is the creation of man. It is formed by the love of self. The earthly state seeks glory for man. On the other hand, the divine state is the creation of God. All individuals cannot be the members of the divine state. Those who are disciples of Christian religion, they are the members of the divine state. Its membership is essential for the salvation of his soul. The city of God is founded in the

hope of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. Since the inception of Christianity in the world, human history has been the dramatic struggle between these two states or cities. Those earthly states that accept Christianity came nearer to the city of God, which finally emerge victorious.

According to Augustine, the purpose of the two states is not same. The City of God is formed in the hope of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. On the other hand, the earthly state is founded for evils. The Divine State is based on justice. But the earthly state is based on power. The heavenly state is eternal. It can never perish. It is universal. The disciples of God can sacrifice everything for the welfare of the people. They want to live in peace and harmony. But the earthly state is not eternal. There is no peace in earthly state. In fact the basis of earthly state is self love.

"One should follow universal rules and must love all people", Augustine stated and further said "Universal peace means a system in which all persons are united with each other by their common love of God." Augustine also expressed the view that the earthly state may perish at any time. It is by its nature impermanent and perishable. The earthly state is built upon those aspects of human nature which are connected with his instinct of war and greed of domination. The cause of fall of Rome was the rule of *Satan*. On the other hand the divine state is imperishable. It looks after heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. The heavenly state would endure on account of its virtue and permanent character. The city of God is controlled by the church. One should follow all the ethical principles of the church. The church is the symbol of God. As such it has authority over all people. As such St. Augustine wanted to spread the message of Christianity through his book 'The City of God'.

1.2.4 Views on State

According to St. Augustine, the state is a divine institution. It is the result of gregarious nature of man. It is created by God to remedy the human sins. But the state is not a supreme organisation. It is inferior to Church and God. The authority of the state should also be respected as the state is responsible for maintaining peace and order in the state. It is also responsible for preserving the property of the individuals. The state has also right to make law in conforming to morality and religious principle. There should be close relationship between the state and the church. Both the state and church are essential for human beings. A king needs the spiritual guidance of church and the church cannot function without the law and order provided by the state. The state and church should work in mutual harmony. If the laws of the state are not in violation of morality these must be obeyed because the state has divine sanction. It is remedy for the sins of the people. According to Sabine, "The state had a divine sanction and, therefore, must be ordinarily obeyed, but if the decrees of the state violate laws of religion or morality they must not be obeyed."

According to Augustine, a state which had adopted Christian rules was that of God and others were that of Satan. In Christian states, behind every action of the state authorities there was perfect justice, divine plan and purpose. The people should obey such a state because that way they are serving a purpose of God. Only those laws which are moral from church view point should be obeyed and thus obedience to the authority of state laws is not absolute but relative. A Christian obeys a secular authority because behind state laws ultimate higher will of God is attained and hidden. In this way he has subordinated state to the church. But he has tried to establish a theocracy. Augustine depicted two separate authorities temporal as well as spiritual but has given prior place to spiritual laws over temporal laws. Christians should seek

guidance from the church and that both should mutually help each other. It is only in case of a conflict between the state and the church that he preferred later.

1.2.5 Idea of City of God

St. Augustine portrayed the idea of City of God which is not liable to destruction. The church is actual manifestation of the City of God. He has also enhanced its prestige as compared with worldly state. City of God is founded on love of God and is for promotion of good. It aims at justice, as compared to worldly state which is based on self love and power. The church is embodiment of City of God because it promotes virtue and goodness. The church and the state are interdependent but ultimate power is vested in the hands of ecclesiastical hierarchy. Membership to city of God can only be through grace of God. But all cannot become members of city of God since all do not deserve it.

In the city of God there will be justice and peace. Justice means conformity, order and respect for duties. Various units of society can make society healthy if they work in accordance with a set and established order. The state is not the final society because there is also universal society with a universal order. The sole aim of city of God is to promote peace in ordered relationship with each other. There can be universal peace with universal brotherhood, love and order. Church is representative of city of God. In city of God membership is open only to those who have grace of God. Everyone in the city of God will be bound by the bonds of common love. Thus, Augustine attempted to explain the causes for the fall of the Roman Empire, combating Paganism and strengthening church. Pointing out the significance of Augustine's writings Murray maintained, "It laid the foundations of Holy Roman Empire and paved the way for the complete subjection of the state to the church."

1.2.6 Conception of Justice

St. Augustine's conception of justice is related with religion. Justice, to him, was conformity to order and as such could prevail in the city of God. There cannot be justice in a society where the people have no faith to Christianity. Justice also means that one should perform his duties properly. There can be no justice where the individuals do not perform their duties properly. Thus it is said that Augustine's conception of justice is derived from Plato. Augustine also maintains that justice conforms to order. Every society has certain orders. It is the duty of the different organisations or society to show respect to such orders. All the members of the society should be loyal to God. God is the only supreme authority in the universe who can issue orders. The state may have its own justice, but that cannot be regarded as absolute. If the state issues any order which is not in conformity with the universal order, it is not just at all. A state will be unjust if it violates universal orders. According to Augustine, "Absolute justice is only possible in a universal society, a society of all members under the headship of God." Thus, justice means conformity to order and performance of duties which arise out of that order. Absolute justice can be possible only in absolute order. A state which conforms to universal order can give complete justice. In order to become a real state, its subjects must be Christians. People those who are not Christians, they cannot be just. Further, the state should have relations with the church. Augustine's justice is also related with law. There cannot be justice without law.

1.3 Contribution of Augustine

St. Augustine was the most important political thinker of the medieval Europe. His '*Civitate Dei*' has been characterised as the mine of ideas. He moulded the ideas

of the rulers like Charlemagne and Otto the Great. It is said that Thomas Aquinas and Dante drew largely from his writings. He also influenced Gregory and Martin Luther. His concept of Christian commonwealth became the basis of Holy Roman Empire to a great extent. His subordination of secular authority to spiritual authority became the basis of ecclesiastical oneness. Thus, his idea of Christian commonwealth greatly contributed to the development of the idea of world government. Augustine propagated the idea that political authority was not absolute and that there was also a higher authority over the state. Thus he shook absolute nature and character of the state from its very basis. He also challenged the established idea that state laws should be obeyed under all circumstances. Universalism which was the key note of the medieval thought was another basic concept of Augustine's thought. The concept of universal society, as expounded by him again remained alive in the middle ages. Thus, Augustine was regarded as the most influential thinker of middle ages and his philosophy practically remained the foundation of the philosophy of his age. According to Ebenstein "St. Augustine, the greatest of the Church Fathers, stood at the turning point of two worlds, that of antiquity and Christianity." Sabine also termed Augustine's writings as 'mine of ideas' which influenced and inspired the later writers.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – 1

1. Define Augustine's concept of two cities.
   ....
   ....
2. 'The state is created by God to remedy human sins', Discuss.
   ....
   ....
3. How did Augustine relate justice with religion?
   ....
   ....

1.4 SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS

St. Thomas Aquinas (1227 A.D.-1274 A.D.) was a famous political thinker of medieval age. He was one of the greatest champions of the church. According to Foster "he was one of the greatest systematic philosophers of the world." Aquinas was born at Sicily in Italy. As a devotee of Christian religion he joined Dominican order at the young age of 19. Later on, he migrated to Paris to study theology and graduated from the Paris University in the year 1252 A.D. In 1256 A.D. Aquinas became a professor of Theology in the Paris University. As a defender of church he wrote a number of books on Christianity, namely '*Against the Errors of Greek*', '*Summa Theologia*' and '*Rule of Prince*'. Thomas Aquinas was deeply influenced by the philosophy of Aristotle. He made Aristotle the cornerstone of his philosophy. Besides, he borrowed from the writings of Stoics, Cicero, Salisburg and other Roman lawyers. In subordinating state to church, he followed St. Augustine. Aquinas tried to represent Aristotle's philosophy by adjusting Christian doctrine and harmonising both.

1.4.1 Concept of the State

St. Thomas Aquinas held a quite different view from the church fathers as to the origin of the state. According to church fathers, the state was the result of fall and sins of men. The state came into existence to punish the people for their sins. But Aquinas did not accept this view of the church fathers. Like Aristotle he believed that man was a social animal by nature. The state was a natural institution. The state was

necessary for the fullest development and perfection of men. It was also necessary for our social requirements because men are not self-sufficient. They need the aid and advice of others. However, the authority of the state should be limited. The ruler must exercise his authority in accordance with law. Aquinas also prefers a nation state in comparison with a city state. A city state may be self sufficient and perfect but a nation state can still be highly self sufficient for its richer resources of defence.

Aquinas was of the opinion that man was a social and political animal. The state was essential not only because it checked human evil, but also because an individual could not realize himself fully in its absence. Also, Aquinas attempted to support his earlier contention that the higher always rules over the lower by holding that as one man was superior to the others in knowledge and justice; it was good that he should rule over others for their benefit. According to him, ruler ships were trust for the whole community. Aquinas justified the authority of the ruler on the ground that the ruler does it for the common good. The moral purpose of the Government, to Aquinas, is paramount. It is the duty of the ruler to direct the action of every class in the state to live a happy and virtuous life, which is the true end of man in society. Ultimately this must lead to a good beyond earthly society to a heavenly life. It is beyond human power and is in the keeping of priests rather than of rulers. The orderly political life is a contributing cause to this ultimate end. More specifically, "it is the function of the earthly ruler to lay the foundations of human happiness by maintaining peace and order, to preserve it by seeing that all the needful services of public administration, of judicature, and of defence, are performed, and to improve it by correcting abuses whenever they occur and by removing all possible hindrances to the good life."

The moral purpose for which political rule exists implies that authority ought to be limited and checked by the law. Justifiable resistance is a public act of a whole people, and the right is safeguarded by the moral condition that those who resist are responsible for seeing that their action is less injurious to the general good than the abuse which they are trying to remove. Aquinas's interest was essentially in the moral limitations laid upon rulers. He was explicit on the point that a king's power should be limited though he never explained exactly what this meant. As a moralist, he broadly held that the end of the state, as also of the individual, was the realization of good in a virtuous life. To him, the source of all political authority is God who is the Supreme Governor of all things. From God the legitimate authority to govern passes to the whole community. The people under God are sovereign and they may delegate their authority to a monarchical, aristocratic or republican form of government.

1.4.2 Concept of Government

St. Thomas Aquinas was conscious of the purpose of the government. He held that all governments were good or bad accordingly as they worked. The main aim of a man was to lead a virtuous life and that of government was to promote virtue among men to enable them to achieve eternal salvation. The character of a government should be determined according to the fulfilment of this object. Like Aristotle, Aquinas divided the governments into monarchy, aristocracy, polity, tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. He preferred monarchy to a democracy. To him, in democracy people indulge in empty discussion. His preference for monarchy was in line with his earlier argument that one God rules the universe, and one soul rules the body. According to him, the monarchical form of government is the best, because it gives to the state important advantages of unity, regularity, experience and an analogy with Divine

Rule. Tyranny he considered the worst type of government. The degeneration of a monarchy into a tyranny could be possibly prevented if the monarchy were a limited one. A limited monarchy cannot oppress the people. The best form of government is an elective monarchy in which a monarch should be made to take an oath to observe the constitution of the state so that if he breaks the oath he can be justifiably deposed. "The king must work for the sake of the kingdom and not *vice versa*."

1.4.3 Supremacy of Church

Aquinas regarded the rule of God as superior to that of man. He held that a secular ruler could properly perform his functions only in co-operation with and under the guidance of the Church. Salvation was to be achieved not through reason but through faith. On all questions of faith the church was the final authority. The pope must be obeyed by everyone, including the temporal rulers, in everything whether relating to temporal or ecclesiastical affairs. A king might be the image of God, but if he disregarded the church he could be excommunicated. In assigning superiority to the church over the most exalted of secular rulers, including the Holy Roman Emperor, Aquinas was only theorizing over a *fait accompli.* Besides, like all good medievalists, Aquinas believed in the fundamental importance of unity amidst universal disorder and anarchy. He believed that unity could only be achieved by the supremacy of the Papacy over all persons and all classes, spiritual or temporal. According to Aquinas, there should be close relationship between the church and the secular authority. At the same time it is the duty of the political rulers to administer secular affairs in such way as to further God's will and to this extent, the official of the state must be subject to priests and to the divine law of the church. Thus, it is evident that Aquinas regarded the church as the superior organisation to the secular state. The secular authority should always carry on the orders of the church as it represents the will of God.

1.4.4 Philosophy of Law

One of the most important and lasting contribution of St. Thomas Aquinas to the political philosophy is his idea about law and justice. According to Sabine, "Human law is for him part and parcel of the whole system of divine government whereby everything both in heaven and earth is ruled." To him law was the rule and the standard of human action. Its end is to promote happiness and common good. It should be brought to the notice of all concerned for their implementation. To be law an action must be promulgated by a competent authority. It should not be opposed to the general wishes of the people. A law is a degree as well as reason. Since there was nothing absolute in the universe, law cannot be exception to this rule. Law is interlinked with reason and must be in conformity with that. It is of practical reasoning and universal and natural. Everything else is under law which cannot easily be changed. Law should never be against human nature. It should always express reason. It should have the approval of the masses in order to become effective for implementation. It is connected with justice. According to Dunning, "Thomas Aquinas's theory of law is the channel through which the doctrines of Aristotle, the Stoics, Cicero, the Roman imperial jurists and St. Augustine blended into a rounded whole were transmitted to modern times."

According to Aquinas, the will of the sovereign has the force of law, otherwise the sovereign will be saviour of lawlessness rather than that of law. He said that "Law is in all those things that are inclined to something by reason of some law." He was of the view that laws ought to be changed; not in view of any improvement, but for the sake of a great benefit or in the case of a great urgency.

Aquinas built up a structure of law in which the most important position was given to eternal law. He has given fourfold classification of laws namely eternal law, natural law, divine law and human law.

- **Eternal Law:** The eternal law emanates from the divine reason. It governs both animate and inanimate kingdoms. It governs the whole universe. It is identical with reason and is truth in itself. It is the type of law through which God governs the whole of universe. According to Sabine, "It is the eternal plan of Divine wisdom by which the whole creation is ordered. In itself this law is above the physical nature of man and in its entity beyond human comprehensions."
- **Natural Law:** It is the type of law which influences people to dictate the reason of eternal law. It is a type of law which is written in the heart of the people. It is a reflection of divine reason in human beings. It helps in distinguishing between good and evil and also in seeking good and avoiding evil. It helps the people in developing the idea that men should live in society.
- **Divine Law:** It is the outcome of commands of God through revelation. It is not the result of natural reason but gift of God. It varies from community to community and changes from time to time. This law is not concerned with secular activities. It is concerned with the spirit.
- **Human Law:** It is the outcome of human customs and conventions. It has its origin in human wisdom. It is positive in nature. It is promulgated by the princes. It should aim at common rather than individual welfare. These laws should only touch temporal and not spiritual affairs. It is derived from natural law and is not subordinate to it. According to Foster, "Human law is the system of rule for the regulation of man's conduct worked out for human reason from the principles of Natural laws."

This theory of laws has many far-reaching implications. He worked out the relationship between eternal law, natural law and human law. He combined the concepts of laws of the Greeks, Romans and Christian church fathers. He made uncompromising appeal to reason. Even under special circumstances unreasonable law should be obeyed to avoid social disturbances. Aquinas gave due importance to moral elements in law and so also to the common good of the community. According to Aquinas, justice is the basis of law. It is expressed only through law. He derives the idea of justice from Aristotle. According to Aristotle, justice is something eternal and gives everyone its due. Like Aristotle Aquinas maintains that there are two kinds of justice – corrective justice and distributive justice. Distributive justice consists in proper allocation of award to everyone according to his worth or ability. Everyone has right to take part in the government according to his ability. On the other hand, the conception of corrective justice is negative idea. It implies that one should do his allotted work. He should not interfere with other works. To Aquinas, there is close relationship between justice and law. If the laws are bad, there cannot be sound justice. Justice and laws are interlinked and interconnected.

1.5 Contribution of Aquinas

St. Thomas Aquinas was one of the most outstanding personalities of the middle ages. He was an intellectual and liberal thinker. He attempted to revive Aristotelian philosophy in so far as it did not come in conflict with the church philosophy. He was an influential writer and a systematic philosopher. His contribution to the political philosophy is as follows:

1. **Welfare State:** In his philosophy Aquinas mooted the idea of welfare state. By pleading that the state should upkeep the population, look after the poor, promote justice and make roads safe and living he safely planned the idea of welfare state which is being adhered even today.

2**. Constitutional Government:** Aquinas favoured the idea of monarchy as the ideal form of government. But to him that was not absolute but limited one. According to him, monarch should be bound by the laws of the state because their violation would make him a tyrant. By imposing limitations on the authority of monarchs he put forth the idea of the constitutional government which is today considered as the ideal form of government.

3. **Classification of Laws:** Another contribution of Aquinas is the classification of laws based on reason. He did not make law the command of the superior but only a product of reasonable thinking. No law should be obeyed for being merely a command of the superior. Dictates of law should be honoured because of their being based on sound reasoning alone. In addition to this, he has tried to link laws with justice. According to Carlyle, "His treatment represents a very important aspect of the significance of the rational element in law."

4. **Revival of Aristotle's Philosophy:** Aquinas borrowed heavily from Aristotle in many ways. He was so much indebted to him that he has been called as 'Christianized Aristotle.' He is mainly responsible for the revival of Aristotle's philosophy in the west. He agreed with the philosophy of Aristotle so long as it did not clash with church ideals. Graham says, "None before no one after 15^{th} century had studied Aristotle as thoroughly as Thomas had done."

5. **Basis of State:** Aquinas was the first political thinker in the middle ages who declared that the state is not the result of fall of man or due to his sins. It is a moral institution and stands to promote the welfare of its subject. It is an outcome of social instinct of man. The state is not only required to perform negative function of punishing the guilty but positive functions of promoting virtue and good life. Aquinas was the first thinker in middle ages who attached natural and moral basis to the state.

6. **Systematic Knowledge:** Aquinas maintained that philosophy should best be studied in a systematic way. He assimilated various fragments of knowledge and combined them together into a solid philosophy. He systematised reason with faith. His system was so perfect that Foster has described him as one of the greatest systematic philosophers of the world.

7**. Natural Law:** Aquinas gave the concept of natural law in a very systematic manner. He subordinated human law to natural law. His ideas about natural law influence the thinkers of Glorious Revolution including Locke. To quote Maxey, "In reviving the Roman doctrine of natural law and in stressing the rational elements in human law St. Thomas made a far reaching contribution to political thought."

8. **Reconciliation of Church and State:** Aquinas was a staunch supporter of church. He would not tolerate any secular interference in church affairs. But he made a sincere effort to reconcile church and state authorities. If moral uplift was left to the church and political one to the state, there would be no clash between the two.

9. **Welfare of the People:** Another contribution of Aquinas is that he did not ignore the masses and cared for their welfare. He said that the ruler should look after the poor masses, he should make roads secure for them and so on. Thus, St. Thomas Aquinas contributed a lot for the development of philosophy. To quote Dr. J.E. Greene, "Aquinas was the greatest synthesizer of theology and philosophy."

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - 2

1. How did Aquinas differ himself from church fathers regarding the origin of state?

   ....

   ....

2. Why did Aquinas prefer monarchy to democracy?

   ....

   ....

3. Explain Aquinas's view on law.

   ....

   ....

1.6 LET US SUM UP

St. Augustine was the greatest Christian philosopher of the early middle ages and St. Thomas Aquinas of the late medieval period in Europe. St. Augustine reinterpreted and transformed the tradition of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and Plotinus with the idea of dual nature of man with a body and soul, both of which should be given equal importance. Though he did not regard the state as natural, it did not imply that there is no moral duty of political obedience on the part of the citizens.

St. Thomas Aquinas brought together different strands of thought such as Aristotelian, Roman, Patristic, Augustinian and Jewish to integrate them into an organic whole under the rubric of Christian philosophy. Aquinas believed that faith does not contradict reason, but complements it, it is reaffirmation of reason rather than its denial. He agreed with Aristotle that the state is natural and claimed that it is not the highest institution. He Christianised Aristotle's theory and brought it to line with Augustine's religious philosophy. But he rejected many of the accepted dogmas of Christian theology and did not accept Augustine's view on slavery and property.

1.7 KEY WORDS

Theologian: a person who engages or is an expert in the study of religious faith, practice, and experience.

Bishop: a priest of high rank who is in charge of the priests of lower rank of a church.

Antiquity: the ancient past, especially the period of classical and other human civilizations before the Middle Ages.

Salvation: liberation from sin and its consequences, believed by Christians to be brought about by faith in Christ.

1.8 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Ahuja, M.L. (2013): *Western Political Thought*, Black Prints, New Delhi.
2. Ebenstein, E (1970): *Great Political Thinkers*, Oxford, New Delhi.
3. Gupta, R.C. (2001): *Great Political Thinkers*, Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra.
4. Jha, Shefali (2010): *Western Political Thought: From Plato to Marx*, Pearson, New Delhi.
5. Nanda, Durga Shankar (2014): *Western Political Thought,* Astha Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi.
6. Nelson, Brian R (2004): *Western Political Thought*, Pearson, New Delhi.
7. Sabine, George H (1973): *A History of Political Theory*, 4th ed. Revised by T.L. Thorson, Oxford, New Delhi.
8. Sharma, S.K. & Sharma, Urmila (2013): *Western Political Thought*, Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd. New Delhi.

POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - 1

Answer to Q. No. 1

According to Augustine, man is a citizen of two cities, namely the city of his birth and the city of God. One is the Divine State and the other is the earthly state. This is because man's nature is two-fold. He is both spirit and body. The earthly city is founded due to the impulses of lower human nature. t is formed by the love of self. On the other hand, the divine state is the creation of God. All individuals cannot be the members of the divine state. Those who are disciples of Christian religion, they are the members of the divine state. Its membership is essential for the salvation of his soul. The city of God is founded in the hope of heavenly peace and spiritual salvation. Since the inception of Christianity in the world, human history has been the dramatic struggle between these two states or cities. Those earthly states that accept Christianity came nearer to the city of God, which finally emerge victorious.

Answer to Q. No. 2

The state is a divine institution, Augustine maintained. It is the result of gregarious nature of man. It is created by God to remedy the human sins. But the state is not a supreme organisation. It is inferior to church and God. The authority of the state should also be respected as the state is responsible for maintaining peace and order in the state. It is also responsible for preserving the property of the individuals. The state has also right to make law in conforming to morality and religious principle. There should be close relationship between the state and the church. Both the state and church are essential for human beings. A king needs the spiritual guidance of church and the church cannot function without the law and order provided by the state. The state and church should work in mutual harmony. If the laws of the state are not in violation of morality these must be obeyed because the state has divine sanction. It is remedy for the sins of the people. According to Sabine, "The state had a divine sanction and, therefore, must be ordinarily obeyed, but if the decrees of the state violate laws of religion or morality they must not be obeyed."

Answer to Q. No. 3

St. Augustine's conception of justice is related with religion. Justice, to him, was conformity to order and as such could prevail in the city of God. There cannot be justice in a society where the people have no faith to Christianity. Justice also means that one should perform his duties properly. There can be no justice where the individuals do not perform their duties properly. Thus it is said that Augustine's conception of justice is derived from Plato. Every society has certain orders. It is the duty of the different organisations or society to show respect to such orders. All the members of the society should be loyal to God. God is the only supreme authority in the universe who can issue orders. The state may have its own justice, but that cannot be regarded as absolute. If the state issues any order which is not in conformity with the universal order, it is not just at all. A state will be unjust if it violates universal orders. According to Augustine, "Absolute justice is only possible in a universal society, a society of all members under the headship of God." Thus, justice means conformity to order and performance of duties which arise out of that order.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - 2

Answer to Q. No. 1

St. Thomas Aquinas held a quite different view from the church fathers as to the origin of the state. According to church fathers, the state was the result of fall and

sins of men. The state came into existence to punish the people for their sins. But Aquinas did not accept this view of the church fathers. Like Aristotle he believed that man was a social animal by nature. The state was a natural institution. The state was necessary for the fullest development and perfection of men. It was also necessary for our social requirements because men are not self-sufficient. However, the authority of the state should be limited. The ruler must exercise his authority in accordance with law.

Answer to Q. No. 2

St. Thomas Aquinas held that all governments were good or bad accordingly as they worked. The main aim of a man was to lead a virtuous life and that of government was to promote virtue among men to enable them to achieve eternal salvation. The character of a government should be determined according to the fulfilment of this object. Like Aristotle, Aquinas divided the governments into monarchy, aristocracy, polity, tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. He preferred monarchy to a democracy. To him, in democracy people indulge in empty discussion. His preference for monarchy was in line with his earlier argument that one God rules the universe, and one soul rules the body. According to him, the monarchical form of government is the best, because it gives to the state important advantages of unity, regularity, experience and an analogy with Divine Rule.

Answer to Q. No. 3

According to St. Thomas Aquinas, law was the rule and the standard of human action. Its end is to promote happiness and common good. It should be brought to the notice of all concerned for their implementation. To be law an action must be promulgated by a competent authority. It should not be opposed to the general wishes of the people. A law is a degree as well as reason. Since there was nothing absolute in the universe, law cannot be exception to this rule. Law is interlinked with reason and must be in conformity with that. It is of practical reasoning and universal and natural. Everything else is under law which cannot easily be changed. Law should never be against human nature. It should always express reason. It should have the approval of the masses in order to become effective for implementation. It is connected with justice.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, G.B: *Civilization During the Middle Ages*
2. Bowle: *The History of Western Political Thought*
3. Emerton: *Introduction to the Middle Ages*
4. Gettell, R.G.: *History of Political Thought*
5. Hearnshaw, F.G.C. : *The Social and Political Ideas of Middle Ages*
6. Taylor, H.O.: *The Medieval Mind*
7. Vaughan, R.W.B.: *Life and Labours of St. Thomas Aquinas*

MODEL QUESTIONS

1. Discuss St. Augustine's explanation of Divine superiority.
2. Discuss the views of St. Augustine regarding the conception of the state.
3. Evaluate St. Augustine's ideas of City of God.
4. Examine the contribution of St. Augustine to the history of political thought.
5. Analyse the political thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. How far does it mark a turning to that of Aristotle?

6. "Law is nothing but an ordinance of reason for the common good promulgated by him who has the care of the community." (Aquinas) Comment.
7. Discuss Aquinas's views on state. What should be the functions of the state according to Aquinas?
8. "St. Thomas Aquinas represents as no medieval writer does the totality of medieval thought." Explain.
9. Evaluate the contribution of St. Thomas Aquinas towards the political philosophy.

Unit-II
NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI

Structure:

2.0 Objectives:

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the methods of Niccolo Machiavelli's study.
- Understand the political thought of Niccolo Machiavelli.
- Analyse the Machiavelli's Classification of Government.
- Get acquainted with Machiavelli's views on Religion and Politics.
- Highlight and discuss the major political theories of Machiavelli.

2.1 **Introduction**:

In the previous unit you have studied about the thoughts and ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine. In this unit you will learn the thoughts of Niccolò Machiavelli (1469 – 1527) who was an Italian historian, politician, diplomat, philosopher, humanist and writer based in Florence throughout the Renaissance. Machiavelli was a founder of contemporary political science, and more specifically political ethics. He was Secretary to the Second Chancery of the Republic of Florence from 1498 to 1512, when the Medici were out of power. He wrote his masterpiece, *The Prince*, after the Medici had recovered power and he no longer held a location of responsibility in Florence. He commanded a sinister reputation as no other thinker in the history of political theory.

The initial reaction to Machiavelli's writing was one of shock and he himself was denounced as an inventor of the devil. This was because Machiavelli sanctioned the use of deception, cruelty, force, violence and the like for achieving the desired political ends. Spinoza regarded him as a friend of the people for having exposed the Prince. Montesquieu regarded him as a lover of liberty, an image that emerged in the *Discourses* and not from *The Prince*. His moral and ethical beliefs led to the creation of the word Machiavellianism which has since been used to describe one of the three dark triad personalities in psychology. This unit thus aims to highlight and analyse the major political thoughts and ideas of Machiavelli and make the learner aware of this modern political thinker.

2.2 A Brief Life Sketch of Niccoolo Machiavelli

Machiavelli was born in Florence in 1469. He was the third child in a family that was neither rich nor aristocratic, but well connected with the city's famed humanistic circles. Florence was economically prosperous but suffered a long period of civil strife and political disorder. His father Bernado, a civil lawyer, held several important public appointments. Besides his legal practice, Bernado also received rents from his land, making his family financially comfortable' Bernado took considerable interest in the education of his son. At the age of 29, Machiavelli entered the public service in the government of Florence. Later he was sent on a diplomatic mission to several foreign countries where he acquired firsthand experience of Political and diplomatic matters. Although not employed on the highest level of policy making, he was close enough to the inner circles of the administration to acquire firsthand knowledge of the mechanics of politics. In 1512, he lost his job when the republican government, based on French support was replaced by the absolute regime of the Medici, who has been restored to power with papal help. Machiavelli was accused of serious crimes and tortured, but he was found innocent and banished to his small farm near Florence. It was in such enforced leisure that he wrote, *The Prince* (1513). The book was dedicated to the Medici family, Lorenzo II de Medici (1492-1519), Lorenzo de Maginificient's grandson. *The Prince* explored the causes of the rise and fall of

states and the factors for political success. As Gramsci has rightly pointed out, the basic thing the Prince is that it is not a systematic treatment , but a 'live' work, in which political ideology and political science are fused in the dramatic form of a myth'. The most elaborated work of Machiavelli is the *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius* (1521). Taking Roman history as a starting point, the Discourses attempts to divide the framework of body politic, and on a much more philosophical and historical foundation than that of the *Prince*.

Early impact on Machiavelli's writings

Machiavelli was born in a tumultuous era when changes were reflected in the entire fabric of European society. At the dawn of the 16th century, the Councilor Movement was stopped by the monarchist reaction. Political power, which was largely dispersed among the feudatories and corporations, was rapidly gathered into the hands of the king, who for the time being was the main beneficiary of increasing national unity. This growth of absolute monarchy, like that of the feudal constitutional monarchy, took place in almost every part of Western Europe. However in Italy no power appeared great enough to unite the whole peninsula. Machiavelli wrote during a period when much chaos and confusion prevailed in Italy which was divided into a number of small principalities and five large states: Milan, Venice, Florence, Naples and Papal Domain. Italians suffered all the degradation and oppression of tyranny with few of its compensations and divisions among the tyrants left the land a prey to the French, the Spanish and the Germans. The Florentine Republic though culturally vibrant and creative, reflected severe factional conflicts and institutional breakdown. Writing at such a time, Italian unification became the chief objective for Machiavelli who could clearly see the development and political evolution taking throughout Europe.

Importance on History

Machiavelli had tremendous faith in history out of the conviction that the study of history was of crucial significance for an understanding of the contemporary reality. Getting opportunity to meet the influential statesmen of his day, Machiavelli tried to understand the reason of a stable political authority and the success of empires. Ancient Roman history offered him the most convenient parallels and political truths. He relied in history because he believed that one, who desires to foresee what is going to take place, should consider, what has already taken place. As Italian society and politics was facing worst political corruption and moral degradation, therefore the freedom of the country and the common good became the core themes of Machiavelli's writings. Besides it was Machiavelli's firm belief that the basis of contemporary politics was selfish political seizure and violence and not good Christian ethics.

2.3 Impact of Renaissance

Machiavelli was deeply influenced by the spirit of Renaissance in Europe with Italy being the epicentre. The Renaissance signified a rebirth of the human spirit in the attainment of liberty, self-confidence and optimism. In contradiction to the medieval view, which had envisaged the human being as fallen and depraved in an evil world with the devil at the centre, the Renaissance captured the Greek ideal of the essential goodness of individual. This return to a pre- Christian attitude towards humans, god and nature found expression in all aspects of human endeavour and creativity. The Renaissance signalled the breakdown of a unified Christian society, challenging the clerics' points of view and formulating political theories of a secular bent.

Complementing this, was also the beginning of the modern state, replacing the papal supremacy by secular, sovereign, independent states, each with its own national culture, language, identity and most importantly an absolute ruler.

In almost all fields of human thinking, there were freedom of speech and expression and Machiavelli became the chief exponent of this school of thought. The international conflict, following geographical discoveries, produced the concepts of nationalism and nation- state which went against medieval universalism in church and state. As a child of Renaissance, Machiavelli disregarded conventional morality and was greatly inspired by the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Machiavelli looked at things from the viewpoint of the ruler rather than of the ruled. His political realism allowed him to remain neutral towards the means that were to be employed for achieving the ends.

2.4 Machiavelli's Conception of Human Nature

Like Hobbes, Machiavelli too believed that human nature is essentially selfish and that the effective motives on which a statesman must rely are egoistic, such as the desire for security in the masses and the desire for power in rulers. It was only under compulsion or when there was personal gain that an individual was ready to do well. Moreover Machiavelli believed that human nature is profoundly aggressive and acquisitive; men aim to keep what they have and to acquire more.

Machiavelli argued that men are always in a condition of strife and competition which threatens open anarchy unless restrained by the force behind the law, while the power of the ruler is built upon the very imminence of anarchy and the fact that security is possible only when there is a strong government. In particular he insists that successful government must aim at security of property and of life before everything else, since these are the most universal desires in human nature. As such he believed that a successful state must be founded by a single man, and the laws and government which he creates determine the national character of his people.

Machiavelli always believed that human nature remains constant, making it possible to deduce principles of political behaviour. In spite of his depiction of the dark side of human nature, he never lost faith in the importance of good society and its role in shaping human beings, and so advised the ruler to abstain from moral degradation and corruption.

Check Your Progress-1

1. To who did Niccolo Machiavelli Dedicated *The Prince*?
2. What does Machiavelli think about the nature of man?
3. What was the main objective of Machiavelli's political thought?

2.5 Attitude Towards Religion and Separating it from Politics

Machiavelli writing reflects nothing except politics, statecraft and the art of war. For deeper lying social questions, economic or religious, he had no interest except as they bore upon politics. He was scathing in his attack on the church for their failure to provide moral aspiration. However he was not anti religion and considered religion as necessary not only to man's social life but also for the prosperity of the state. Yet he has a positive attitude toward religion; albeit his religion becomes a tool of influence and control in the hands of the ruler over the ruled. Machiavelli sees in religion the poor man's reason, ethics, and morality put together and 'where religion exists it is easy to introduce armies and discipline'. In his book, *The Prince*, he therefore advised the ruler to do anything and everything possible to cultivate belief in religion, even if the ruler in his personal capacity was irreligious.

Machiavelli does not believe in the Christian conception of a good person endowed with some supernatural or divine element and hence paganism. However he retained the basic Christian views on the differences between good and evil. For instance, he regarded murdering one's co-citizens, betraying one's friends, disloyalty and irreligiousness as lack of virtue not entitled to glory. Machiavelli was clear that Italy needed a religion similar to one that ancient Roman had, a religion that taught to serve the interest of the state. He was categorical that Florentines needed political and military virtues which Christian faith did not impart.

Machiavelli took politics out of the context of theology and subordinated moral principles to the necessities of political existence and people's welfare. He believed that state is the highest form of human association and should be considered more prominent than any other ethical considerations. Religion is only a social force which is working within the state and thus cannot be above the State. Accordingly laws were to be created by the state and individual ethics did not apply to the actions of the state.

Machiavelli's achievement lies in providing a secular and amoral picture of the state and scientifically enquiring into its nature and behaviour. His political realism allowed him to remain neutral towards the means that were to be employed for achieving the ends. While fear of God can be replaced through fear of the prince, if there is a strong enough prince, Machiavelli felt that having a religion is in any case especially essential to keeping a republic in order. For Machiavelli, a truly great prince can never be conventionally religious himself, but he should create his people religious if he can. Just as to Strauss he was not the first person to ever explain religion in this method, but his account of religion was novel because of the method he integrated this into his common explanation of princes.

2.6 Dual Standards of Morality

Machiavelli whispered that public and private morality had to be understood as two dissimilar things in order to rule well. While the state had a morality of its own- the morality of success – the private individual was at all times to display qualities that were in consonance with the highest moral standards. As a result, a ruler necessity be concerned not only with reputation, but also positively willing to act immorally at the right times. To him the end was important which could be attained by any means.

For Machiavelli the home and family nurtured these moral values, teaching the individual the virtues of independence, simplicity, purity, loyalty and trust. He also wanted the Prince to be compassionate, loyal and honest, however at times willing to use force, fraud and deception to maintain stability in the state. Machiavelli always wanted to establish the autonomy of politics rejecting the divine rights theory of kings. His amorality implies that in certain specific situations, a ruler must have to use certain tactics that were not considered strictly moral but are necessary to achieve the desired result for the betterment of the state.

Machiavelli not only separated morality from politics, but also relegated religion to a very subordinate position in his political thought and it is because of this that we think that the modern study of politics begins with Machiavelli. Morality was not totally denied but was treated as secondary to politics and hence Machiavelli 'was not immoral but unmoral in his politics'. The moral code of conduct applicable to individuals cannot be applied to the actions of state. The ruler is the creator of law as also of morality, for moral obligations must ultimately be sustained by law and the ruler is not only outside the law, he is outside morality as well. There is no standard to

judge his acts except the success of his political expedience for enlarging and perpetuating the power of his state.

2.7 The Prince

The Prince, of Machiavelli is the product of the prevailing conditions of his time in his country, Italy. As it is not an academic treatise or value oriented philosophy; it is in real sense real politics. It is a memorandum on the art of government, is pragmatic in character and provides technique of the fundamental principles of states craft for a successful ruler. It deals with a machinery of government which the successful ruler can make use of it. Machiavelli divided *The Prince*, into twenty six chapters which were further divided into three parts. The third part of the book is the most important one as it offers ways to a prince to learn statecraft and the rules of state governance.

Chapter XVIII of *The Prince*, gives Machiavelli's ideas of the virtues which a successful ruler must possess. Integrity may be theoretically better than collusion, but cunningness and subtlety are often useful. The two basic means of success for a prince are the judicious use of law and physical force. He must combine in himself rational as well as brutal characteristic, a combination of lion and fox. The ruler must imitate the fox and lion, for the lion cannot protect himself from the traps and the fox cannot defend himself from wolves. A prudent ruler, according to Machiavelli, ought not to keep faith when by doing so it would be against his interest and when the reasons which made him bind no longer exist. The fundamental principle of the Prince is that the State is the highest association. It reflects the national character. Nobody is above the state. The law of the state expresses the character of the state. A successful Prince must abstain from personal property and women. These two things can take away his interest in the administration of the state. Machiavelli advised the Prince to adopt a policy of coalition rather than remain isolated, for neutrality was impossible both domestically and internationally. Further the ruler should seek to constantly expand the state's territory and play the balance of power game skilfully by appearing to be the defender of weaker states.

A Prince must realize the importance of a strong army for the state. No nation can survive without a powerful army. He can only do so if enough finance is available to him. But the real strength of the army resides in the patriotism of people. A Prince must be able to obtain the opinion of his people on various matters. He must create a feeling in men that the rule is for them and use the sentiments of the people. As far as the state is concerned, the prince need not feel burdened by any childish considerations of justice or injustice, good or bad, right or wrong and honour or dishonour. He advises the Prince to use subtlety to deal with the affairs of the public.

According to Machiavelli, the Prince is above laws. He is above all codes and conducts. He need not watch for the morality and immorality of his actions. He is bothered only about the end results. Force may be used to eliminate political rivals, to coerce resistant populations, and to purge the society of other men strong enough of character to rule, who will inevitably effort to replace the ruler. The means is not an issue for him. While selecting the officials, the Prince should be careful to avoid flatterers. This is the greatest challenge to a Prince. To differentiate between those who flatter and those who present facts is difficult. He must also take steps to keep the royal matters as secret. There is no doubt that Machiavelli had a temperamental admiration for the resourceful, if unscrupulous, type of ruler and a deep distrust of half- way measures in politics. The growing success of rulers like Julius II and Caesar

Borgia deeply influenced Machiavelli and he wanted that the Prince should resemblance such quality in order to unite Italy.

In contrast with Plato and Aristotle, Machiavelli insisted that an imaginary ideal society is not a model through which a prince should orient himself. Concerning the differences and similarities in Machiavelli's advice to ruthless and tyrannical princes in *The Prince*, and his more republican exhortations in *Discourses on Livy*, several have concluded that *The Prince*, although written as advice for a monarchical prince, contains arguments for the superiority of republican regimes, similar to those establish in the *Discourses*. In the 18th century the work was even described a satire, for instance through Jean-Jacques Rousseau. More recently, commentators such as Leo Strauss and Harvey Mansfield have agreed that *The Prince* can be read as having a deliberate comical irony.

2.8 Machiavelli's Classification of Government

In both '*The Prince* and *Discourses*', Machiavelli insists on the necessity of extending the territory of the state. According to him, either a state must expand or perish. His idea of the extension of the dominion of state did not mean the blending of two or more social or political organisations, but the subjection of a number of states under the rule of a single Prince or common wealth. However he argued that for the success of a state there should be a strong government at the centre, an integrated public authority recognized by all and an army of its own citizens. Like Aristotle, Machiavelli emphasized on wise constitutional machinery for the effective running of the state and laid importance on mixed constitutions. He contended that in a mixed government the separate classes would, through the institutions of representation limit one another's power thereby ensuring liberty to all.

Machiavelli accepted the Aristotelian classification of government besides endorsing the ideas of Polybius and Cicero who gave importance to the principle of checks and balances. However he was a firm advocator of republican form of government as it maintains general economic equality and thus was suitable for the political community. It also provides equal opportunity to all its subjects and is reconcile to the new changes in the political spectrum. Besides a well ordered state had to ensure that the rich did not buy their offices with money as it would promote corruption. Moreover Machiavelli was equally against the hereditary monarchy and feudal nobility and the established church, as they destabilise the social and political order of any state.

As a realist in nature Machiavelli was more concerned with the actual working of the machinery of government than the abstract principles of the state and its constitution. As Prof. C.C Maxey has rightly pointed out 'his passion for the practical as against the theoretical undoubtedly did much to rescue political thought from the scholastic obscurantism of the middle ages.' His realism is well brought out by his doctrine of aggrandizement, which he advocates both in *The Prince* and *Discourses*. Machiavelli was convinced that the rule of law would supersede factional and private interests and hence he explored a constitution that would uphold and preserve the rule of law.

Importance on Lawgiver

Machiavelli gives prominent place to the law giver and law in his theoretical arena. Laws are necessary for the smooth running of state machinery, besides being a powerful instrument against corruption. To shape the national character of the citizens and to inculcate moral and civic virtues among individuals, the law giver takes the

prominent role for the reformation in the society. Moreover the lawgiver had to satisfy the aspirations of the elite and that of the lower classes while restraining both at the same time, transforming the qualities and powers of both the classes for the betterment of the state and stability of the ruler.

2.9 Machiavellian

Machiavelli was a true child of renaissance. He assimilated the political aspirations of his times and converted into a coherent and acceptable theory paving the way towards a Nation state system based on secularism and individualism. His concepts and principles may not be always plausible; but no one can deny his role in the particular juncture in the transformation of the European world. He filled a great gap in the theory and practice of politics in Europe. Machiavelli is mainly well-known for a short political treatise, *The Prince*, written in 1513 but not published until 1532, five years after his death. Although he privately circulated *The Prince*, in the middle of friends, the only theoretical work to be printed in his lifetime was *The Art of War*, in relation to the military science.

Machiavelli’s works are sometimes even said to have contributed to the contemporary negative connotations of the languages politics and politician, and it is sometimes thought that it is because of him that *Old Nick* became an English term for the Devil and the adjective *Machiavellian* became a pejorative term describing someone who aims to deceive and manipulate others for personal advantage. Machiavellianism also remnants a popular term used in speeches and journalism; while in psychology, it denotes a personality kind. While *Machiavellianism* is notable in the works of Machiavelli, Machiavelli's works are intricate and he is usually agreed to have been more than presently ‘Machiavellian’ himself. For instance, J.G.A. Pocock saw him as a major source of the republicanism that spread throughout England and North America in the 17th and 18th centuries and Leo Strauss, whose view of Machiavelli is quite dissimilar in several methods, agreed in relation to the Machiavelli's power on republicanism and argued that even though Machiavelli was a teacher of evil he had a nobility of spirit that led him to advocate ignoble actions. Whatever his intentions, which are still debated today, he has become associated with any proposal where ‘the end justifies the means’.

Machiavelli was one of the exponents of civic republicanism, inspiring subsequent scholars from diverse standpoints like Hobbes, Bodin, Spinoza, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Burke, Hegel and de Tocqueville. Contemporaries like Gramsci praised the greatness of Machiavelli for separating politics from ethics. Machiavelli's realism and encouragement of by innovation to attempt to manage one's own fortune were more accepted than his emphasis upon war and politics. Not only was innovative economics and politics a result, but also contemporary science, leading some commentators to say that the 18th century Enlightenment involved a ‘humanitarian’ moderating of Machiavellianism. In the words of Dunning, ‘The Brilliant Florentine was in the fullest sense the child of his time.’ He discarded religious thinking and said, ‘end justifies the means.’

Check Your Progress- 2

1. Why Machiavelli is so often called a secular humanist?
2. What advice did Machiavelli offer to the Prince?

2.10 Let Us Sum Up

- Machiavelli represents a phase of all modern society, but he represents it in the exaggerated form appropriate to Italy in the sixteenth century.
- Writing at a time of political chaos and moral confusion, Italian unification became the chief objective for Machiavelli, who could see clearly the direction that political evolution was taking throughout Europe.
- Renaissance ushered in rationalism which viewed God, man and nature from the stand point of reason and not faith. Machiavelli was very much a creature of the Renaissance, his native city of Florence being then the centre of Italian Renaissance.
- While in *The Prince*, Machiavelli highlighted the importance of the security and unity of the state as the primary concerns of a ruler, in the *Discourses*, the theme was liberty and republicanism.
- By emphasizing on the importance of the study of history, Machiavelli established a method that was extremely useful.
- Machiavelli was the first to speak of the raison d'état of the state. Machiavelli's importance was in providing an outlook that accepted both secularisation and a moralisation of politics. He took politics out of context of theology, and subordinated moral principles to the necessities of political existence and people's welfare.
- Machiavelli was the first to systematically analyse the power view of politics, laying down the foundation of a new science.
- For Machiavelli, a well ordered and stable state ensures the security and well being necessary to combat social conflict and the radical selfishness of human nature.
- Machiavelli firmly believed that the basis of contemporary politics was selfish political seizure and violence and not good Christian ethics.
- Machiavelli's thoughts had a profound impact on political leaders throughout the contemporary west, helped through the new technology of the printing press.

2.11 Key Words

- **Renaissance:** A cultural movement that originated in Italy in the 14^{th} century, reviving the classical form of art, architecture and literature that later spread to the rest of Europe, marking the beginning of the Early Modern Age.
- **Councillor Movement:** A reform movement in the 15^{th} and 16^{th} century Catholic church which held that supreme authority in the church resided with an Ecumenical council, apart from, or even against the pope.
- **Rationalism:** A view that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge rather than religious belief or emotional responses.
- **Republican:** A form of government**,** which is headed not by a monarch or dictator and is usually associated with the rule of law.
- **Secularism:** A belief system that religion and religious considerations should be excluded from civil affairs and public education.
- **Monarchy:** A form of government where a monarch, a kind of hereditary ruler is the head of the state.
- **Unification:** The process of bringing together or joining of two or more things into one unit.

- **Realist:** An individual who observe things as they are, accepting the true nature of a situation and deals with it in a practical manner.
- **Ethics:** A set of moral principles that deals with what is good and bad, governing a person's behaviour.

2.12 Suggested Readings

- Dunning, W. A., *A History of Political Theories: Ancient and Modern,* Macmillan & Co., Ltd., New York, 1902.
- Sabine, G. H., *A History of Political Theory,* Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., Calcutta, 1961.
- Subrata M., and Sushila R., *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt., New Delhi, 2006.
- Strauss, Leo and Cropsey J., *A History of Political Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987.
- Miller D. (ed.), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1987.
- Sharma S.K., and Sharma U., Western Political Thought: From Plato to Burke, Atlantic Publishers Pvt., New Delhi, 2013.

Possible Answers to 'Check your Progress'--

Check Your Progress-1

1. Machiavelli dedicated *The Prince*, to Lorenzo de Medici, the then ruler of Italy.
2. Machiavelli believed that human nature is selfish and profoundly aggressive and acquisitive; men aim to keep what they have and to acquire more.
3. The main objective of Machiavelli's political thought was to unify Italy and establish a strong and stable state.

Check Your Progress-2

1. Machiavelli's approach to humanism represents a dramatic shift from traditional Christian ideas of virtue to a belief in the importance of self interest, as justified by secularism. He expresses the opinion that virtue is not a 'black and white', concept, and holds that actions should be judged as right or wrong based on their utility.
2. Machiavelli advised the Prince that the two basic means of success for a prince are the judicious use of law and physical force. He must combine in himself rational as well as brutal characteristic, a combination of lion and fox. The fundamental principle of the Prince is that the State is the highest association.

Model Questions:

1. Evaluate Machiavelli's views on absolute monarch in his work *The Prince*?
2. Enumerate the main features of Machiavellian Politics?
3. Explain Machiavelli's concept of human nature?
4. Discuss Machiavelli as the founder of modern political thought?
5. Analyse Machiavelli's views on the relation between religion and politics?
6. Discuss Machiavelli's background and his contribution to medieval thought?

BLOCK -3

UNIT-1

Thomas Hobbes

Structure:

1.0 Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able to

- Describe the life and works of Thomas Hobbes
- Examine the influences that shaped the political thinking of Hobbes
- Make an critical evaluation on Hobbes's concept of Human Nature
- Analyze Hobbes concept of State of Nature and its shortcomings
- Evaluate Hobbes theory of social contract
- Make an assessment of the concept Natural Rights as advanced by Hobbes
- Examine critically the sovereignty theory propounded by Thomas Hobbes.
- Evaluate Hobbes as an individualist

1.1 Introduction

In the previous unit, you have got an idea of Machiavelli's political thinking. Now, we shall discuss the political philosophy of one of the great political thinkers from England named Thomas Hobbes. Dear learners, you have already studied social contract theory and the views expressed by the three advocates of this theory. Thomas Hobbes was one the proponents of this theory.

Thomas Hobbes was an English philosopher who is considered one of the founders of modern political philosophy. He is best known for his masterpiece *Leviathan*. His stern advocacy of social contract theory i.e., the theory which addresses the question of the origin of state and legitimacy of the authority of state over the individual makes to call him as a contractual political thinker. His status as a great philosopher and political thinker was not fully recognized until the 19th Century. By the mid-20th Century Hobbes was acclaimed as "probably the greatest writer on political philosophy that the English speaking people produced. According to Michael Oakeshott: "The *Leviuthan* is the greatest, perhaps the sole, masterpiece of political philosophy in the English language". Now, he is generally regarded as the father of modern political science. It is he who for the first time systematically expounded the absolutist theory of sovereignty and originated the positivist theory of law which was perfected by the analytical jurists of the 19th and 20th centuries.

In his life-time he was almost unanimously denounced for his alleged atheism, blasphemy and impiety and was known as the Monster of Malmesbury. He was clespised by the parliamentarians whom he opposed and suspected by the 'royalists whom he purported to support, because his ideas were quite out of step both with the parliamentarians' theory of popular representation and the Stuart theory of political legitimation based on the Divine Right of Kings. His *Leviathan* was a clear reflection of it.

Hobbes is acclaimed for his bold and systematic attempt to assimilate the science of man and civil society to a thoroughly modern, mathematical physical science corresponding to a completely mechanistic conception of nature. His psyclio1ogical egoism, his ethical relativism and his political absolutism are all supposed to follow logically from the assumptions or principles underlying the physical world which primarily consists of matter and motion, or rather matter in motion.

The greatness of Hobbes as a thinker can be acknowledged as there was so many important and suggestive ideas and perspectives of thought are adumbrated and found interwoven in his comprehensive, though complex and multi-faceted system of philosophy. It is true that Hobbes' extremely pessimistic and unedifying view of human nature is not only highly distorted and exaggerated but incompatible with the

very idea of a civil society. But it is also a fact that, as a perceptive thinker he prescribed the way for possible solution of the problems faced by the people of Britain.

In this unit, you will get a comprehensive idea on the political thinking of Hobbes. A thorough reading of this unit will enable you to understand the situation under which Hobbes theorized his ideas. It will also give you the opportunity to compare the ideas of Hobbes with other political thinkers of the west. You could also make an estimate of Hobbes as a Political Thinker and his contribution towards political thought.

1.2 Life and Works

Thomas Hobbes, the greatest political thinkers from England was born on April 5, 1588. Born prematurely when his mother heard of the coming invasion of the Spanish Armada, Hobbes later reported that "my mother gave birth to twins: myself and fear. His father was a member of clergy near Malmesburg, Wiltshire. The economic condition of his family was not relatively good. Therefore Hobbes was brought up by his uncle. Thomas Hobbes was educated at Westport church from age four, passed to the Malmesbury school, and then to a private school kept by a young man named Robert Latimer, a graduate of the University of Oxford. Hobbes was a good pupil, and around 1603 he went up to Magdalen Hall, the predecessor college to Hertford College, Oxford. The principal John Wilkinson was a Puritan, and he had some influence on Hobbes. In his early days, Hobbes showed his talent and learnt a number of languages. He could speak and read Latin, Greek, French, Italian and English. Even in his schooldays, he translated Euripides's *Medea* from Greek to Latin. In 1629, he translated Thucydides's 'history of the Peloponnesian' into English from Greek. It was his first publication. He also translated Homer's Odyssey and Iliad into English. He was a quick writer of both prose and verse. It is found that Hobbes wrote the last ten chapters of his masterpiece Leviathan in an amazing span of less than a year.

Hobbes learnt scholastic logic and physics at Oxford University. However, he disliked education imparted at Oxford, dismissing scholasticism as a collection of absurdities. After completing his education, he was recruited in 1618 into an aristocratic household at first as a tutor and later as secretary. The rest of his life was spent in the employment of this family (the family of Lord Cavendish who came to be known as Earl of Devonshire) or its neighbours and cousins. He had got opportunity to make grand tour to Europe for several times. These tours gave Hobbes a unique opportunity to meet both politicians and intellectuals, enabling him to gain many new insights. He met eminent people like *Galileo* Galilee, Pierre Gassendi (1592-16550 and Marin Marsenne (1588-1648). He corresponded with Descartes who was in hiding in the Netherlands; finally the two met in 1648. Of all the place he visited, Venice made the most lasting impression.

By the end of 1640, Hobbes had written two drafts of philosophical works, which included *De Cive* (1642). With a fear of persecution by the Long parliament for his *Elements of law*, he fled to France in November 1640 and stayed there till the winter of 1651-1652.

The English Civil War broke out in 1642, and when the royalist cause began to decline in mid-1644, the king's supporters fled to Europe. Many came to Paris and were known to Hobbes. This revitalized Hobbes's political interests and the *De Cive* was republished and more widely distributed.

The company of the exiled royalists led Hobbes to produce *Leviathan*, which set forth his theory of civil government in relation to the political crisis resulting from the war. Hobbes compared the State to a monster (Leviathan) composed of men, created under pressure of human needs and dissolved by civil strife due to human passions.

During the years of composing *Leviathan*, Hobbes remained in or near Paris. In 1647, Hobbes felt seriously ill. But inspite of illness his famous work appeared in April 1651. In October 1969, he fell ill and finally died of paralysis on 3 December. In 1670, the *Behemoth* was published. In 1683, the *Leviathan* and the *De Cive* were condemned and burned at Oxford University. In 1688, a revised Latin edition of the Leviathan was published.

1.3 Influences on Hobbes

Eventful incidents in the life of eminent thinkers often help in dissecting their outlook and philosophical foundations. Hobbes was not an exception of it. Thomas Hobbes, the greatest English Philosopher was influenced by the socio-economic and political circumstances prevailed during sixteenth century in England. The political turmoil in Britain, occurred especially after 1580s, as well as the socio-economic instabilities formed the basis of Hobbes's political philosophy. His paramount consideration for order in society emanated largely from two happenings in his life, resulting in his fear of violent death and the need for all contentments of life. These two unrelated incidents in his life help us to understand Hobbes's political philosophy. The first was the fear of the Spanish Armada that stimulated his mother's labour and Hobbes premature birth. The second was the outbreak of the English Civil war in 1641 and Hobbes had to flee from England. In both the cases it was the fear that held the key. It is reason why some recent biographers of Hobbes say that "Hobbes and fear were born twins".

As already mentioned, Hobbes was greatly influenced by the civil war i.e. the armed conflict and political confrontation between the parliamentarians and the Royalists over the issue of supremacy .In fact the political writings of Hobbes was prompted by the civil wars and were intended by him to exert influence upon the side of the king. His *Leviathan* was a reflection of the civil strife in England. He was critical to the constitutional rule based on popular consent. As such his writings were designed to support an absolute government. During civil war he showed his sympathy towards the royalist and tried to popularize absolute monarchy as a most stable and orderly form of government.

Besides, Hobbes was influenced by new developments in the physical sciences and by the works of Bacon, Kepler and Galileo. He indeed lived in a period of scientific temperament. There was significant progress in mechanical science. For example there were discoveries of kepler, Galileo, and Descartes. New light was thrown on physiology and magnetism. Newton's Principia created sensation in the academic world. As a result, Hobbes also developed a scientific outlook. Although he was the son of a clergyman, religion failed to create any positive impact on his mind. It is because his knowledge of material and mechanical science. He not only studied various subjects of science and philosophy, he had an intention to know the world, peoples, society and culture around him.

Check Your Progress -I

(a) According to Hobbes, his mother gave birth to twins; one was Hobbes himself and what was the other?

(b) In which year *Leviathan* was published?

(c) During civil war in England which conflicting group was supported by Hobbes?

(d) Which form of government in England was preferred by Hobbes?

1.4 Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

It is said that Hobbes was the product of embroiled political, social, economic and religious situation that he witnessed. Particularly the gradual deteriorating political situations of Britain made Hobbes extremely thoughtful and helped to develop his political philosophy. From his personal experience he put emphasized that fear and self-interest was two fundamental human motivations which needed to be tempered and controlled by an omnipotent sovereign power. Therefore he advocated for an absolute monarchy. His imagination of a pre-political situation named 'State of Nature' differentiated the later from a political society. Using the device social contract, Hobbes tended to explain the origin of state, nature of sovereign, its location and relationship with the individual, the essential functions of the government. He pleaded for an absolute legal authority as it, he thought, could ensure order in the society.

1.4.1 Hobbes views on Human Nature

Hobbes's concept of Human nature is one of the significant aspects of his overall political philosophy. Like Machiavelli, Hobbes also expressed his views regarding human nature. However, he did not theorize about proper behavior from an understanding of the idea of Good. Unlike Aristotle and the medieval political thinkers, Hobbes viewed human being as isolated, egoistic, self interested and seeking society as a means to their ends.

According to Hobbes, human beings are always guided by his or desires and the principles of pleasure and pain. As the pleasure is good and pain is bad, individuals tend to pursue and maximize pleasure and avoid pain. On the other hand, individuals constantly make attempts to satisfy their desires. To Hobbes, continual success in the attainment and fulfillment of their desires was felicity, a condition of movement and not rest.

Hobbes asserted that every human action, feeling and thought was ultimately physically determined, yet he allowed ample scope for voluntary, self designed and administrated changed in human conditions. Individual can, according to Hobbes, control their action by natural means, i.e. by relying partly on natural passions and partly on reason. Thus Hobbes valued reason. Hobbes admitted it is the reason that enabled the individual to understand the impressions that sense organs picked up from external world, and also indicated an awareness of one's natural passions. Here

Hobbes felt the need of an "arbitrator" or "judge" to resolve rational disagreements. This remained a major theme in the theoretical construct of Hobbes that order was absolutely necessary to control the selfish nature of human actions.

Another aspect of his conception of human nature was his belief in the equality of men. For Hobbes, men are equal in physical power and faculties of mind. Actually, by equality Hobbes meant equal ability and equal hope of attaining the ends individuals aspired for.

Hobbes also saw human beings as active creatures with a 'will'. Human will, in Hobbes philosophy, did not imply anything spiritual or transcendental but was related to the natural needs of the body. Since they are creatures endowed with both reason and passion, so differences in passion created differences in wits with a desire to excel other. Here comes the issue of competition. It is the reason why Hobbes contended that life becomes nothing but a perpetual and relentless desire and pursuit of power. As a result a permanent rivalry exists between human beings for honour, riches and authority leading to a war of everyone against the others.

1.4.2 State of Nature

We have already found in the previous discussion that human beings are by nature selfish. This selfishness of the individual was reflected in his philosophical idea i.e. state of nature. The concept of the state of nature, that is, human condition prior to the formation of civil society, is derived from the nature of man, his basic psycho-physical character, his sensations, emotions, appetites and behavior. Here it can be said that Hobbes concept of human nature and state of nature are well connected. In fact his description of state of nature was a corollary of his depiction of human nature. In the light of bleak and pessimistic human nature, the picturization of the state of nature was gloomy and sordid.

In the state of nature, Hobbes stated, there prevailed a warlike situation. People involved in continuous quarrel in the state of nature. The principle cause of conflict was, according to Hobbes, within the nature of man. Competition, diffidence and glory were the three main reasons that were responsible for quarrel and rivalry among the individuals. Although Hobbes very often call it war, but it was actually a warlike situation. The relationship among the individual was of mutual suspicion and hostility. This was a state of permanent conflict of everyone against everyone. In this conflicting situation, there was no law, no justice, no notion of right and wrong with only force and fraud as two cardinal virtues. In addition to it, there was no peace, no tranquility, but tension and animosity. Life of the people was not secured. To quote Hobbes: "the life of man was solitary, poor, nasty, and brutish and sort. This was the picture of the state of nature. Hobbes admits that the picture of the state of nature depicted by him may not be universally correct. But in many places of America that situation prevailed.

Hobbes further added that in the state of nature there was no common power whom everyone will fear. Hence anarchy and warlike situation was the inevitable consequences. In the state of nature, according to Hobbes, there was no well-defined law, no power to implement any decision and no authority to take decision. Since all the people were competitive and loved reputation and glory, society turned into a battlefield with the ultimate aim of preserving everyone's own selfish interest. In such an atmosphere there can't prevail peace and security.

It appears that what is central to Hobbes' psychology is not hedonism but search for power and glory, riches and honour. Power is, of course, the central feature of Hobbes' system of ideas. In the words of Oakeshott "Man is a complex of power;

desire is the desire for power, pride is illusion about power, honour opinion about power, life the unremitting exercise of power and death the absolute loss of power"

One might imagine that in the condition of plenty of resources and amplitude of man's power over natural phenomena and social behavior there would be no serious conflict and the reign of peace and security would prevail. But conflict is inherent in human psychology according to Hobbes; it is implanted in man's inordinate pride, covetousness, sense of fear and insecurity etc. Hobbes also mentions another cause of conflict which cannot simply be traced to Psychological egoism. This relates to the differences among men about what is good and evil, desirable and undesirable. Some scholars have expressed the opinion that Hobbes was principally concerned with the clash of beliefs and ideologies. Shortsightedness may be another factor responsible for the state of strife. Though men are rational creatures prone to strive for their self-preservations, passions frustrate the normal working of reason and blind pursuit of self-interest brings them into conflict with each other. It is to be noted that this is not primarily a historical account but a logical construction from the first premises about human nature.

However, Hobbes' concept of state of nature is not free from criticism. Critics generally argue that Hobbes's depiction of state of nature is full of sheer imagination, that is, it has no practical value. He was not referring to an actual historical process of development of human society. But on this ground it would be wrong to reject Hobbes's concept of State of Nature. Hobbes's depiction may not be fully correct, but the prevalence of anarchical situation cannot be denied. Besides Hobbes himself tone the aggressive view of human nature in *De Cive.* He described natural state as one of war, which was not responsible for the evil in human nature. For Hobbes, it was the absence of "faith" or trust and not the presence of an evil quality in man that caused human misery in the natural state. In conclusion it can be said that he was a product of his times and offered this particular picture of state of nature keeping in mind the conditions of contemporary Britain.

Check Your Progress -II

(a) What are two fundamental human motivations that need to be controlled by an omnipotent power, according to Hobbes?

(b) What was the device used by Hobbes to explain the origin of state and nature of sovereign political authority?

(c) How the views of Hobbes on Human Nature were different from that of Aristotle?

(d) According to Hobbes, what were the basic things lacking in the state of nature?

(e) What were the reasons of conflict among the individuals in the state of nature?

1.4.3 Natural Laws

After State of Nature, Hobbes introduced another important concept, that is, natural right. According to Hobbes, in a state of nature, individual enjoyed complete liberty, including a natural right to everything, even to one another's body. The natural laws were dictates of reason. These were not "laws" or "commands". Subsequently, Hobbes, like Grotious, argued that the laws of nature were also proper laws, since they were "delivered in the word of God". These laws were counsels of prudence.

Natural Laws are nineteen in Numbers. The first law of nature holds that every man should seek peace and preserve it, and if he cannot obtain it, he should "use all helps and advantage of war". The second laws of nature lays down that a man must be willing, along with the others and in the interest of peace and self-preservation, to forswear his rights to all things, be content with as much liberty as would allow others over himself and transfer some of the rights by a contract. The third law of nature commands that "men perform their covenants made". The fourth law says that, the man to whom the rights are transferred causes no injury to the one who makes that transfer. Apart from these four important laws of nature, other laws of nature point to the advisability of an individual accommodating himself to the rest, cultivating complaisance, spirit of freedom, sense of equity and avoiding the spirit of revenge, cruelty, pride and avarice.

Natural laws in Hobbes theory did not mean eternal justice, perfect morality or standards to judge existing laws. They are merely "counsels of prudence". In Hobbes theory of natural rights there is not a thing like common good. They merely created the common conditions which were necessary to fulfill each individual good. These laws were immutable.

1.4.4 Social Contract

As we have found earlier that in the state of nature there was no peace and order. On the other hand, the first laws of nature enjoined the individual to seek peace. Now, question arises how to attain it. According to Hobbes the only way to establish peace and order by establishing state was covenant or contract. To overcome the miserable condition of the state of nature, Hobbes felt that there was a need of a "common power" that could be created through the instrument of covenant. For that purpose, Hobbes maintained, individuals surrendered all their powers through a contract to a third party who was not a party to the contract, but nevertheless received all the powers that were surrendered. The commonwealth or civil society was constituted when multitude of individuals were united in one person, when every person said to the other, " I Authorize and give up my Right of Governing myself, to this man, or this assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorize all his Actions in like manner". The above words represent the central part of Hobbes's concept of social contract.

Thus it appears that the contract created civil society and political authority, for it was a social and political contract. The contract was perpetual and irrevocable. Individuals limited their sovereignty voluntarily by creating a civil society. In the new society created by the people as a whole, each individual guaranteed basic equality with every other member. The sovereign must treat all the individuals equally in matters of justice and levying taxes. Thus Hobbes defined justice as equality in treatment and equality in rights.

Hobbes preferred the beneficiary of the contract, the third person, a monarch. For Hobbes, monarchy was preferable to an aristocracy or democracy because of the

following reasons: (a) the self-indulgence of one compared to that of many would be cheaper; (b) the existence of an identity of interest between the king and his subjects; (c) less intrigues and plots, which were normally due to personal ambitions and envy of members of ruling elite.

On the basis of the above discussion we can highlight the following features of Hobbes concept of social contract:-

- The covenant created a civil society; can be termed as legal institution which was not existed in the state of nature.
- The commonwealth or civil society will be governed by one person, not collectively.
- The covenant created a new political organization named state and the past society ceased to exit.
- The contract made a transition i.e. transition from anarchy to civil society.
- The foundation of the commonwealth was unanimity.
- It is the realization of the individuals lived in the state nature led to the creation of civil society.
- The unlimited power given to the sovereign was meant to remove all kinds' evils from the society.

Check Your Progress -III

(a) What are natural laws in Hobbesian philosophy?

(b) Mention the first law of nature as given by Hobbes?

(c) What was the basic nature of contract as advocated by Hobbes?

(d) Why did Hobbes prefer Absolute monarchy to democracy and aristocracy?

1.4.5 Sovereignty

It has been mentioned above that the covenant created civil society as well as the sovereign. According to Hobbes, once sovereign power was created it would be bestowed with all powers.

The sovereign authority is created out of a covenant among individuals. The sovereign himself stands outside the covenant. He is a beneficiary of the contract, but not a party to it. Each man makes an agreement with every man in the following manner:

"I authorise and give up my right of governing myself, to this man, or to this assembly of men, on the condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorise all his actions in like manner. This is tlie generation of that great Leviathan or rather (to speak more reverenty) of that Mortal God, to which we owe under the immortal God, our peace and defence". (*Leviathan, chpter- 17*).

Thus it is clear that Hobbes's theory of sovereignty is absolutely an indispensable part of commonwealth. In chapter 18 of his masterpiece *Leviathan*, he has announced that the institution of commonwealth will never be complete without the creation of sovereign power. The rights, responsibilities, powers and other "faculties" of sovereign are derived from the covenant.

So far as the nature of sovereign is concerned, Hobbes saw the sovereign power as undivided, unlimited, inalienable, and permanent. It has been said earlier that the

contract created the state and the government simultaneously. His defence of absolute state power in reality was a justification of absolute government or monarchy as he failed to distinguish between state and government. However, his concept of absolute power was not based on the notion of divine rights of the kings, but derived from the contract.

Hobbes tried his best to clearly define the powers and authority of the sovereign. The leviathan, according to Hobbes, was the sole source and interpreter of laws. He was the interpreter of both divine and natural laws. Even, the Leviathan was not subject to civil laws, being the sole source of these laws. The sovereign was bounded by these laws as long as they were not repealed. Hobbes defined law as a command of the sovereign. Since laws is the command of sovereign, it could be wrong, unjust or immoral. The sovereign not only administered the laws but also enforced it.

The sovereign had specific rights and duty. The sovereign had the right and duty to govern conduct policy, protect civil society from dissolution, limit or restrict freedom of expression, opinions, and doctrine, controls subject's property, resolve all conflicts through the right of judicature, make war and peace with other nations, choose ministers, counselors, magistrates, officers both in peace and war, confers honors and privileges, determine artificial religion and forms of its worship, and prevent access to subversive literature. Like, Austin, Hobbes stood for an indivisible sovereign authority. He was against the division of sovereign authority as advocated by the parliamentarians in the England of his time.

Regarding existence of private institution, Hobbes said that lesser associations could exist only with the permission of the sovereign. He did not trust the motives of private institution. Hobbes subordinated the church to the sovereign. According to Hobbes, teachings of the church were lawful only when authorized by the state.

On the basis of the above discussion, the following features of Hobbes theory of sovereignty can be highlighted.

- Sovereignty was a product of contract made by the individuals lived in the state of nature.
- Although it was created by a contract, but Sovereignty was not a party to it and not bound by the terms of the contract.
- In spite of the absoluteness, the sovereignty is incapable of injuring anybody.
- The sovereign has no power to kill or invalidate his subjects and in the same way, the subjects cannot kill the sovereign.
- The main responsibility of the sovereign to maintain peace and order in the society.
- The sovereign has the power the censor opinion particularly the religious opinions.
- The command of the sovereign will be treated as laws and the decisions of the courts shall be treated as sovereign's decisions.
- The sovereign can transfer some of his duties to other and the same will be performed in the name of the sovereign.

A close scrutiny of Hobbes theory reveals that he advocated all powerful absolute sovereignty. The sovereign will make use of both law and a sword. He will first try to rule with the help of law and any failure will compel him to use the sword. However, Hobbes believed that sword was the most effective way to put everything under control. Thus he made the sovereign absolute. It is interesting to note that

Hobbes has called his sovereign Leviathan i.e. a sea monster. In other words, by Leviathan Hobbes indicated a very large and powerful creature, an autocratic monarch. Although there is lots of criticism against the absoluteness of the sovereign, it is found that Hobbes deliberately created it keeping in mind unruly behavior of the people lived in the state of nature. So it is wrong to assume that the creation of an absolute sovereign was an unthoughtful and without any plan.

Critics point out that Hobbes's sovereignty is outside the contract and hence not obliged to obey terms and conditions of the contract. Since sovereign resides above everything else the subjects has no legal rights or power to accuse him of doing or not doing anything. But Hobbes justified it and contended that absolute sovereign is necessary to maintain peace and order in the society.

1.4.6 Individualism

In the previous discussion, we have found that Hobbes philosophy contained certain element s of absolutism. But it is wrong to assume that Hobbes was against individualism. In fact, he was a great worshipper of both absolutism and individualism. There are several elements of individualism in his thought. Chapter xxi of Part II of Leviathan deals with the individualism. The title of this chapter is Liberty of Subject. In this chapter, Hobbes defined liberty in the following way- "Liberty or freedom signifies the absence of opposition. By opposition I mean external impediments of motion." According to Hobbes individuals are free to do whatever they want. People may have their own thoughts and plan to work.

Hobbes asserted that society was constituted by free and equal individuals who were egoistic, self-interested and atomistic. The individual had the right to his private space, namely thoughts and economic activities. The individual did not get subsumed or merged in the all- powerful state. In other hands individual will have separate existence. If the individual is threatened, then the Leviathan lost its rational to exercise. So, Hobbes was undoubtedly one of the greatest individualists.

According to Hobbes the sovereign owed his existence to the individuals, and derived his power from them. The individuals did not disappear into a cohesive community, but retained their individuality and identity. Thus it makes clear that Hobbes was quite alert of individual's freedom. The individual, while making contract also exercised their freedom. In the creation of civil society, individual were guided by their own will. They were not forced or induced by others to set up the commonwealth.

Another element of Hobbes's individualism was right to self-preservation. The sovereign cannot order any person to kill or wounded himself. Or, if anyone attacks, the person shall have the right to defend himself. In other words, every individual has the right to self-defense. Besides, individuals have the right to live and for that purpose they can take food and medicine and other necessary things they require. The sovereign has no power to force a man to confess something. Apart from these, individual will have the right choose profession, right to get justice, right to earn property etc.

Check Your Progress -IV

(a) What is meant by *Leviathan* in Hobbes Political philosophy?

(b) What was the nature of sovereign as described by Hobbes?

(c) Mention two elements of individualism in Hobbes political philosophy.

(d) Is it correct to say that Hobbes deliberately made a design of an absolute sovereignty?

1.5 Let Us Sum Up

In this unit we have tried to present Hobbes as a Contractual Political Thinker. His stress on covenant or contract is clearly discussed in this unit. The brief life sketch of Hobbes gives an ample evidence of the times he lived and formulated his political ideas. His theories reflect political ideology of the incipient capitalist market society characterized by the doctrine of "possessive individualism". His method was deductive and geometrical rather than empirical and experimental. According to Hobbes the root cause of conflict in the state of nature are the passions of desire and aversion. Since goods are limited, there is ruthless competition and a struggle for power to retain what is acquired. Conflict is inherent in human nature in blind pursuit of self interest. It was reflected in his concept of Human Nature. . Another thing that Hobbes points out is that each man has liberty to use his own power as he will for preservation of his own nature and life. This he calls natural right. But at times he equates natural right with power, at times with absence of obligations or with liberty to do that which right reason prescribes. To escape this state of nature and to avoid war man is endowed with reason and rational self-preservation. These are known as laws of nature which play an important role to transform of state of nature into a civil society. In order to escape the state of nature, individuals renounce their natural rights and institute a third person or body of persons conferring all rights on that person or body, authorizing all its action as their own. This common superior or sovereign has to be created through a covenant with the sovereign outside this covenant.

Sovereignty is indivisible, inalienable and perpetual. The Sovereign acts according to natural law but he alone is the interpreter of this law and his action cannot be challenged. After the constitution of civil society, natural law is assimilated into civil law. * He restricts the natural liberty of men but does not espouse the individual's right to restrict authority of the state. Thus he made fusion of absolutism and individualism in his political philosophy.

1.6 Key Words

Absolutism- A political theory that hold the absolute power of the political authority or government or the rulers.

Sovereignty- Literally it means Supreme i.e. the supreme power of the state. It is the most essential element of state.

State- A politically organized society works under a single system of government.

Civil society- the community of individuals organized by common interest

Individualism- a political philosophy that emphasizes on the freedom of the individual.

1.7 Suggested Readings

If you want to know more on the political philosophy of Hobbes, you can go though the following books-

1. J.W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the sixteenth century, London, Methuen, 1967
2. Iain Mclean, Alistair McMillan, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics, Oxford University Press, 2008
3. S.K. Sharma, Urmila Sharma, Western Political Thought, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, new Delhi, 2003
4. H. Warrender, The political Philosophy of Hobbes, Oxford University Press, 1957

Possible Answer to CYP

(1) (a) Fear (b) 1651 (c) the Royalist (d) Absolute Monarchy

(2) (a) Fear and self-interest (b) contract or covenant (c) Contrary to Aristotle views of human being as social animal, Hobbes viewed human being as isolated, egoistic, self interested. (d) in the state of nature, there was no peace, no order, no common power, no security of the life of the people (e) Competition, diffidence and glory were the three main reasons that were responsible for quarrel in the state of nature

(3) (a) Natural laws were the dictates of reason. These are the counsels of prudence. (b) The first law of nature holds that every man should seek peace and preserve it, and if he cannot obtain it, he should "use all helps and advantage of war" (c) social and political in nature (d) Monarchy was preferable to an aristocracy or democracy because of the following reasons: (a) the self-indulgence of one compared to that of many would be cheaper; (b) the existence of an identity of interest between the king and his subjects; (c) less intrigues and plots, which were normally due to personal ambitions and envy of members of ruling elite.

(4) (a) All powerful monarch (b) Undivided, unlimited, inalienable, and permanent. (c) Atomistic view of individual and right to self-preservation (d) yes, the creation of an absolute sovereign was not an unthoughtful and without any plan.

References

1. Subrata Mukerjee, Sushila Ramaswami, *A History of Political Thought*, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, Third edition, 2003
2. P.G.Das, *History of Political Thought*, new Central Book Agency, Kolkata, 2014
3. R.C.Gupta, *Great Political Thinkers*, Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal Educational Publishers, Agra, 2002
4. Ian Adams, R.W. Dyson, *Fifty Great Political Thinkers*, Routledge, London, 2007
5. S.K. Sharma, Urmila Sharma, *Western Political Thought*, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, new Delhi, 2003
6. Bhandari D.R. *History of European Political Philosophy*, The Bangalore Printing & Publishing Company.
7. Gauba P.O., *Western Political Thought*, Macmillan Publishing India Ltd., 2011.

8. Nelson R. Brian, *Western Poltical Thoughts- From Socrates to the Age of Ideology*, Pearson, 2007
9. Sabine H. George, Thorson L. Thomas, *A History of Political Theory*, Oxford & IBH Publishing, 1973

Model Question

1. Describe briefly the life and works of Thomas Hobbes.
2. Examine the influences that shaped the political thinking of Thomas Hobbes
3. Make a critical evaluation on Hobbes's concept of Human Nature. Is it realistic?
4. Analyze Hobbes's concept of State of Nature and its shortcomings
5. Evaluate Hobbes theory of social contract regarding origin of state
6. Make a critical assessment of the concept Natural Rights as advanced by Hobbes
7. Examine critically the theory of Sovereignty propounded by Thomas Hobbes.
8. Evaluate Hobbes as an individualist.
9. Make an assessment of Thomas Hobbes as a Political Thinkers.

Unit-II

John Locke

Structure

2.0 Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able to

- Elaborate the life and works of John Locke
- Analyze Locke's views on State of Nature
- Examine Locke's concept of law of nature
- Evaluate the social contract theory propounded by John Locke
- Describe Locke's conception of natural rights and private property
- Evaluate Locke concept of consent and the right to resistance

2.1 Introduction

In the previous unit, we have discussed the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes. Now we are going to discuss the political philosophy of another English Political thinker named John Locke. Like Hobbes, Locke also used the device of social contract to trace the origin of state and society and therefore he is also considered as contractual political thinkers.

John Locke was an English philosopher, widely regarded as one of the influential figures of the Enlightenment and commonly known as the "father of Liberalism". Like Hobbes, Locke made use of the idea of a state of nature as an explanatory conceit upon which to build his political theory. His political philosophy encompasses the depiction of state of nature, nature of contract, law of nature, natural rights, and right to property, nature of government or political authority, consent, right to resistance etc. His ideas of constitutionalism, freedom, consent, property, and tolerance have played a crucial role in an orderly development of western democracies. Locke has been interpreted by differently different people. Laslett convincingly demonstrated that Locke was neither a spokesman of Whig orthodoxy nor a defender of the Glorious revolution of 1688. Macpherson, on contrast, analyzed Locke as an apologist of bourgeois society. On the other hand, Ashcraft interpreted Locke as a revolutionary. Ashcraft's interpretation of Locke as a revolutionary created problem for both the left and right. The Marxist interpreted Locke as an apologist of bourgeois society. Locke is also interpreted as collectivist because of his insistence that community would be ruled by the will of the majority. Some people describe him as a champion of individuality. He was the spokesman of the liberal democratic order. Locke's fight against patriarchy and his emphasis on the equal rights of women made him to consider him as a feminist.

In this unit, attempt will make to get a real picture of John Locke as the political philosopher. You will also get an idea on John Locke's theorizing of state, society, government, authority, sovereignty and political obligation. After going through this unit you will be able to compare the political philosophy of Locke with that of his predecessor Hobbes. You will also be able to examine the contribution made by Locke to the political thought in general and liberal tradition in particular.

2.2 Life and works

John Locke is one of the greatest political figures in the history of Western Political Thought. He was born at Wrington in Somersetshire in 1632. His parents came from Puritan trading and landowning families, and were sympathetic to the parliamentarians and the Whigs during civil war. Initially his family was not well-off, but later Locke enjoyed sufficient income from family estates and was to able to lead a life of a gentleman scholar. Locke started his schooling at prestigious Westminster school in 1647. After completing studies there he was admitted in Christchurch College, oxford in 1652 studied there for 15 years till 1667. Locke was awarded

Bachelor's Degree in 1656 and completed MA in 1658. After Graduation, he developed an interest in medicine and obtained a bachelor of medicine in 1675. In 1661, he joined as a lecturer in rhetoric in 1663. In 1664, he became a censor of moral philosophy.

As noted earlier, he was interested in medicine and studied medicine extensively during his time at Oxford. He participated in chemical and medical researches of eminent people like Robert Boyle, Hooker, David Thomas, Richard Lower, Thomas Willis and Thomas Sydenham. From them, he learnt a lot. He was also influenced by the Descartes and Gassendi, the important Continental philosopher of early scientific revolution.

In 1665-1666, Locke undertook a diplomatic mission to Cleaves. In 1666, he met Lord Anthony Cooper, the first Earl of Shaftesbury and important political figure of the court of Charles II. His meeting with Ashley and later his joining in Ashley's household in London became a turning point in his life. In 1668, Ashley underwent a major and critical liver operation under Locke's Supervision which was successful against all odds. By 1679, Locke became a patron, political associate and friend of the earl and remained associated with him for next 14 years.

Locke's first works were written at Oxford namely the *two tracts on government* in 1660-1662, and the *Essays on the Law of Nature* in Latin in 1664. In both these writings he argued against religious toleration, and denied consent as the basis of legitimate government. Locke was suspected of being the author of *A letter from Person of Quality to his Friend in the country* which angered the government and compelled Locke to depart for France in 1675. At the end of April 1679, he returned to London. In 1679, his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* was forbidden as a text for tutorial discussions in Oxford and its colleges.

It has been mentioned earlier that the Earl of Shaftesbury played a profound role in shaping Locke's political perceptions and establishing his reputation as an eminent theorist. He was in fact Locke's mentor, friend, philosopher and guide. Locke learnt a lot from him. Shaftesbury's commitment to toleration for dissenters made him campaign for toleration and the freedom of press.

In 1983, Locke went into exile in Holland, under strong suspicion of involvement in the Rye house plot i.e. the plan of assassination of Charles II. The British Government tried to get him extradited but was unsuccessful. His studentship of Christchurch College was withdrawn in 1684 on a royal command from Charles II. All the punitive measures were taken against his as he was actively participating in the movement for curtailing royal powers. Meanwhile his mentor Lord Shaftesbury died in 1683.

During his exile in Holland, Locke completed his *Essay concerning Human Understanding,* and *The Letter on Toleration,* published anonymously in 1689.

Thus it appears that Locke's life coincided with one of the most significant epochs of British history that saw the transformation of absolute monarchy into parliamentary democracy. It was a period of the Glorious Revolution of 1689 with which Locke was closely associated. After the successful completion of Glorious revolution Locke returned to England and the publication of his major works he became famous and distinguished. Locke spent remaining part of his life in the household of Sir Francis and Lady Masham whom he later married.

Locke in his later part of his life was the Commission for Appeals and Trade, who dealt with the problems of the English colonies. He opposed the colonial policy

from 1668-1675. He looked upon the colonization of America as a solution to the economic crisis following the great Plague of 1665.

His important works were: 1.*A Letter Concerning Toleration, 1689. 2. A Second Letter Concerning Toleration (1690)3.A Third Letter for Toleration (1692)* 4.*Two Treatises of Government* (1689) *5.An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690)* 6.*Some Considerations on the consequences of the Lowering of Interest and the Raising of the Value of Money (1691) 7. Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693)* 8.*The Reasonableness of Christianity, as Delivered in the Scriptures* (1695) *9.A Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity (1695)*

He died on October 29, 1704. During his long life of 72 years he made immense contribution to the society and politics of England. Locke's concept of constitutionalism, toleration, natural rights, limited government had a significant impact beyond the English settlements of 1688 in establishing and nurturing a liberal society and inspiring a similar traditions in America, France and Holland.

2.3 Locke's views on State of Nature and Law of Nature

Like Hobbes, Locke also starts his analysis with a hypothetical state of nature. In chapter II of his Second Treatise on Civil Government, he has made a comprehensive discussion on the origin and nature of political authority. Like other contractual political thinkers he also believed that men lived in an imaginary state of nature before the formation of state. In Locke's opinion the state of nature was a state of perfect equality and freedom regulated by the laws of nature. The state of nature, far from being a war of all is a state of "peace, goodwill, mutual assistance self-preservation." The individual was naturally free and became a political subject out of free choice. Actually it was a state of license because in the state of nature law of nature was quite operative. According to Locke, the law of nature which was the embodiment of reason prevented men from doing harmful work. Individual enjoyed enormous freedom and was able to do whatever he desired. But the state of nature was not free from contradiction. The main problem was law of nature and its reason was not known to the inhabitants of the state of nature. Since the law of nature was not properly clarified and executed every man has the right to punish another man and very often that happened. In other words, in the state of nature there was no authority to explain and execute the law of nature. The unlimited freedom given to the people sometimes violated the rights of the other. People often interfere in the freedom of the others. According to Locke it was happened due to the ignorance, not out of any bad motive.

It has been mentioned above that the people in the state of nature were guided by the laws of nature. Locke conceived Laws of nature as an embodiment of reason. According to Locke, the state of nature was state of happy and peaceful condition life governed by certain rules. These rules are termed by Locke as Laws of Nature. So, Natural Law constitutes an integral part of Locke's moral and political theory. It is central to his conception of the state of nature as well as of civil society. The state of nature, as we know, is the stock-in-trade of all contract theories of the state. It is conceived as a state prior to the establishment of political society. In Locke's version it is pre-political, though not pre-social, for men are essentially social by nature. It has law of nature to govern it. This Law "obliges everyone: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm one another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions, for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent, and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of

one sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property, whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another's pleasure : and being furnished with like faculties, sharing all in one community of nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us, that may authorize us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another's uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for ours." In the state of nature men have natural right to life, liberty and property. Everyone is bound by reason not only to preserve oneself but to preserve all mankind, insofar as his own preservation does not come in conflict with it. Again, men are free and equal and there is no commonly acknowledged superior whose orders they are obliged to obey. Everybody is the judge of his own actions. But though the natural condition is a state of liberty, it is not a state of licence. Nobody has a right to destroy himself and destroy the life of any other men, "but where some nobler use than its bare preservation calls for it." Because there is no common judge to punish the violation of natural law in the state of nature, every individual is his own judge and has the executive power of punishing the violators of the law of nature. This violation may be against him or against mankind in general. But when men are judges in their own case, they cannot be impartial. There are also other inconveniences in the state of nature-there is no established, settled, known law, to be the standard of right and wrong; there is no impartial judge to decide cases of dispute; and finally, "in the state of nature there often wants power to back and support the sentence when the right, and to give it due execution.'' In other words, there are three lacunas, I or inconveniences' in the state of nature-want of a legislature authority to declare law, of an impartial judge to decide cases of violation of law and lack of an impersonal executioner of the law. Thus we find that the state of nature, while it is not a state of war, is also not an idyllic condition and, therefore, it has to be superseded sooner or later. Conflicts and uncertainties are bound to arise on account of the selfish tendencies in human nature. The state of nature is always in danger of being transformed into a state of war. Where everyone is the judge in his own case and has the sole authority to punish, peace is bound to be threatened.

Locke has claimed that in the state of nature there were several inconveniences .In the state of nature there prevailed peace and order in a limited scale. It is because there was no common judge with authority. Dunning, therefore, stated that the state of nature as imagined by Locke was neither the heaven nor the hell. But Locke’s description of the state of nature was not as gloomy and pessimistic as Hobbes’. Locke admitted that the people of the state of nature were very often guided by reason and good motive and in that situation they wanted to settle the disputes among themselves. In this state they followed the “law of nature”, but the law of nature consists of divine commands and it not imposed by any human legislator. As a result, in order to escape from this situation, they finally decided to set up an authority who will implement the law of the nature. They also decided to institute an authority whose function would be to enforce same law in a uniform manner.

Check Your Progress (1)

(a) How Locke’s depiction of state of nature was different from that of Hobbes?

(b) Mention two important books written by Locke.

(c) In the state of nature people were guided by_______________.(Fill in the blanks)

(d) How did Locke define law of nature?

(e) What were the basic inconveniences faced by the people in the state of nature?

2.4 Social Contract

It has been mentioned above that like Hobbes; Locke also used the device of social contract for the creation of civil society and the establishment of government. Locke stated that there are certain inconveniences in the state of nature. In order to get rid of those inconveniences, the individuals in their own wills entered into a series of contract. Unlike Hobbes, Locke talked of two types of contract. As a first step, the people of the state of nature formed the civil society on the basis of the common consent of the community. After they have set up a political or civil society, the next step 'is to appoint a government or 'legislative' to declare and execute the natural law.

Through his social contract theory, Locke maintained that civil government is proper remedy for the conveniences of the state of nature. He further added that the civil government alone cannot be the provider of remedy, a civil society is also necessary. According to Locke, civil society came into existence from the consent of its members. He stated that that civil power as the right of making laws with penalties for the regulating and preserving of property. The power came into existence by consent because men entered into a contract, to get rid of the incremonials of the state of nature and the state of nature changed into a political power.

The sovereign power created by the contract is vested in the community as a whole not in any one single person. The contract must be unanimous and irrevocable. It is because after having once made it, the people cannot go to the original state. However, the contract should respect the natural rights i.e. rights to life, right to liberty and right to property.

The followings are the basic feature of the social contract theory:

- The contract is of each with all
- Each individual agrees to aid to the community as a whole
- Contract is unanimous and based on the consent of people
- Social contract was a sort of mechanism that was used by the people to remove certain difficulties.
- The contract empowered the people to control the government
- The contract was irrevocable as men cannot return back to the state of nature
- Men surrendered their personal rights to interpret and administer the law of nature but they do not surrender the natural rights of life, liberty and property.

The following points of criticism are advanced against Locke's concept of social contract.

- Critics argue that Locke's theory tried to protect the propertied class.
- Like Hobbes, Locke also held a limited and wrong concept of human nature.
- The distinction between state and government was not very clear in Locke's theory.
- The concept of contract is criticized as imaginary, not realistic.
- Critics say that Locke sacrificed legal sovereign at the alter of popular sovereign.

2.5 Natural Rights and the theory of Private property

The conception of natural rights and the theory of property was one of the important themes in Locke's political philosophy. According to Locke, in the state of nature men enjoyed natural rights to life, liberty and property. These rights are inalienable and inviolable for they are derived from the Law of Nature which is God's reason. These natural rights are derived from natural law and are limited by it. "The freedom of man and liberty of acting according to his will is grounded on his having reason, which is able to instruct him in that law he is to govern himself by, and make him know how far he is left to the freedom of his own will". Thus, liberty, for Locke, was not the freedom to do whatever one chose, but to act within the bounds of the laws of the laws of nature. Freedom is possible only within a framework of law. It is natural law that keeps individual from being subject to the arbitrary will of another person. Natural rights acted as constraining factors on the power of the state, once these were established through a contract between individuals. Locke defended personal independence and freedom as fundamental human right.

In the state of nature, Locke maintained none had a right to coerce or dominate other. Everyone had an equal right to one's natural freedom, without being subjected to the will or authority of any other man. Though Locke categorically rejected the right of a person to kill one's self, he granted the right to inflict penalties, including the death penalty, on others who had violated the laws in general, or if another person's life was threatened. Locke explicitly rejected the right of the individual to commit suicide and murder.

Right to property is intimately connected with right to life and liberty as its necessary consequence. Sometimes Locke sums up all natural rights in the right to property. But property is not his exclusive concern. Life and liberty are more important. Man creates property by mixing his labour with the objects of nature. In the beginning, all things were held in common, But common ownership is not sufficient to provide men with mans of life and satisfy their needs. Man must mix his labour with the resources provided by nature to enable him to make use of them in a more efficacious and profitable way. Since man owns his own person, his body and limbs, the object with which he mixes his labour becomes his own property by right. This is the origin of the famous labour theory of value common to both the classical and the Marxian economics. Locke does not believe that man has an unlimited right of appropriation. There are three important limitations on ownership of property. The first, called "labour-limitation", is that one can appropriate only that much of common resources with which he has mixed his labour. The second limitation, the "sufficiency limitation" enjoins man to appropriate only as much as is required by him and leave "enough and as good for others." The third limitation; known as a 'spoilage limitation', requires that man should acquire a thing only if he can make good use of it, since

nothing was made by God for lnan to spoil or destroy. If one takes more, he "invades his neighbour's share" which is prohibited by the law of nature.

Locke spoke of individuals in the state of nature having perfect freedom to dispose of their possessions, and persons, as they thought fit. He clarified that since property was a natural right derived from natural law, it was therefore prior to the government. He emphasized that individual had rights to do as they pleased within the bounds of the laws of nature. Rights were limited as they did not harm themselves or others.

While discussing the right to property, Locke stated that it represented human entitlements and in fact "the great and main aim of men's uniting into commonwealth and putting themselves under government is the preservation" and protection of their property. The purpose of the government was to secure human entitlements and ensure lives, liberties and their material possessions of all human beings. Even if the commonwealth was based on freely elected representatives, it could not dispose of the property of its subjects arbitrarily. It was the social character of property that enabled Locke to defend a minimal state with limited government and individual rights and reject out-right and hereditary principal of government.

According to Locke, state was created for the sole protection of property, consequently no part or the whole of the individuals's property could be taken without prior consent of the individuals. Besides, no taxes could be levied without the consent of the individual; otherwise it invaded the fundamental right to property and subverted the ends of the government.

But Locke's conception of Property and his emphasis on it faced severe criticism. Macpherson argued that Locke's views on property made him a bourgeois apologist, a defender of the privileges of the possessing classes. But Macpherson's arguments were challenged by Dunn, Laslett and Tully, who found it difficult to accept Locke as a Spokesman of capitalism. Moreover, the contention by Macpherson that Locke presumed wage slavery in his conception of property was rejected by Ebenstein, who pointed out that Locke used the term "property" in the broad sense for liberating one's self rather than for enslaving others. Dunn contended that Locke was concerned with questions of social justice. In Locke's understanding, justice was linked to ownership of property on the one hand and laws of nature as the will of God on the other hand.

We can conclude in the words of Peter Laslett, "Locke was neither a 'socialist' nor a 'capitalist' though it is fascinating to find elements of both attitudes of ours in his property doctrine, more, perhaps, in what he left out or just failed to say than in the statement themselves. He was not even an advocate of land and land ownership as the basis of political power to be 'represented' in a nation's counsels. For all liis enormous intellectual mid political influence in the 18th Century; he was in this respect a barren field for anyone who wished to justify what once was called Whig obligatory.

But lie did use his property doctrine to give continuity y to a political society, to join generation to generation"

Check Your Progress (2)

(a) Write two features of contract as described by John Locke.

(b) What were the natural rights in Locke's political philosophy?

(c) How did Locke define right to property?

(d) What were the limitations on the ownership of property?

2.6 Nature of Political Authority

As noted above, Locke used the device of contract to establish civil society and thereafter the political authority. At first, individuals consented to submit to majority rule and organize themselves as a community or civil society. They surrendered their powers partially, namely the three specific rights that constituted the natural rights to enforce the laws of nature. Once a civil society was established, the individuals established a government to act as a trust. Within the government, the community appointed a legislative as a supreme power. But people had the right to assess and evaluate the performance of the legislature. If people found the performance unsatisfactory, they could take steps to change or alter the existing body. Besides the legislature, there was an executive, usually one person, with the power to enforce the law. The executive, who included judicial power too, was subordinate and accountable to the legislature. The third wing of the government was the federative power, the power to make treaties and conduct external relations.

Thus it appears that unlike Hobbes, Locke advocated a limited sovereign state. According to Locke, the state should be based on the consent of the people subject to the constitution and rule of law. It would be limited, since its powers were derived from the people and were held in trust. It was also limited by natural laws and individual rights.

Locke made distinction between state and political or the government. Indeed, at times he approximated a secondary contract by which government was created after the establishment of civil society. Although it was the people who create the government for them, supreme power remained in the hands of the community as a whole. The communities had the inalienable right to institute and dismiss a government. If a government is dismissed, this did not signify a return of the state of nature, as it was in the case of Hobbes's theory. Though people granted the legislative power to make law, they always retained a residual right to judge whether its performance was satisfactory and in accordance with the natural laws. Hence, Locke was able to justify resistance to unjust political authority.

2.7 Consent and the right to resistance

As noted above the political authority in Locke's philosophy is based on the consent of the people. In the *second treatise* Locke has tried to explain the basis of legitimate government. Infact government based on consent: is the fundamental principle of Locke's theory of political obligation. The idea of consent, however, is not properly explained and it remains one of the most vulnerable features of Locke's

theory For Locke, it was the consent whom he conceived as the basis of legitimate government. Free individuals, Locke maintained expressed their consent willingly and voluntarily through a contract agreed upon freely among themselves. They agreed to enter into a civil society and establish a government.

For Locke, men became subjects of political authority only by their consent. Without consent there was no political community. Locke spoke of two kinds of consent: express or direct and tacit consent. Express consent was an explicit commitment given at the time when commonwealth was instituted. In case there was no provision for explicit consent, people's obligation could be gauged by their tacit consent. There were two problems with regard to tacit consent. One was to define tacit consent and the other was to determine was to determine how far it was binding.

Locke insisted that all true states were established by consent. He asserted that governments based on consent coupled with the right of people to rebel, was the "best fence against rebellion."People had the right to judge and assess authority, which was no longer sacred and supernatural. Locke emerged as a thorough-going contractualist, unlike Hobbes, whose premises were contractual but whose conclusions supported political absolutism, even though both rejected the divine rights of kings and the divine origins of state. Locke was confident that with more free communication and greater transparency there would be less need for revolution.

However, Locke's work primarily justified the right to resistance, and in the last resort of revolution, against unjust authority. He repeatedly stressed that authority was legitimate if it was based on the consent of the governed. He emphasized that all authority –political and parental-was a trust, given by God.

Check Your Progress (3)

(a) According to Locke, political authority is based on the ___________________of the people. (Fill in the blanks).

(b) What was the main responsibility of the government according to Locke

----

--- ---

(c) On what ground Locke justified right to resistance?

(d) What are the two types of consent as mentioned by Locke?

2.8 Let Us Sum Up

In this unit we have discussed the basic political ideas of John Locke. We have discussed Locke's depiction of state of nature and how it was different from that of Hobbes. In contrast to Hobbes description of a warlike situation, Locke conceived the state of nature as a state of "peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and self-preservation." The Natural Law constitutes an integral part of Locke's political theory. In the state of nature the law of nature was operative, which is God's reason, to govern it. Another important concept discussed is his concept natural right to life, liberty and property, derived from natural law and limited by it. Moreover, his theory of property is also discussed in this unit. Since men are by nature, free, equal and independent, no one can be subjected to political power of another without his own consent. Thus common consent is required to form civil society after which a government or legislative has to

be established to execute natural law. So his views on consent also found sufficient expression in the unit. This authority or the legislative is the supreme authority. Besides this, there are two other powers namely; executive (includes judicial power) and the federative (concerned with foreign affairs). The executive is answerable to the legislative. The legislative cannot rule by arbitrary decrees but only through promulgated and established laws. Thus his advocacy for limited government is also analyzed in this unit. . He has also been described as an apologist of the Glorious Revolution. Rebellion or resistance is an essential part of his philosophy but he does not clearly state who has the right to rebel. And critics even say that he gave that right only to the landed aristocracy but this has been debated. It can be concluded by saying that Locke was a great political thinker who could exert influence on the political theorizing of subsequent periods.

2.9 Keywords

Enlightenment – The European intellectual movement of the late 17th and 18th centuries emphasizing reason and individualism rather than tradition.

Liberalism - The political philosophy that put emphasis on liberty individualism and limited form of government.

Puritans - The Puritans were a group of English Reformed Protestants in the 16th and 17th centuries who sought to purify the Church of England from its Catholic practices.

State- A politically organized society works under a single system of government.

Civil society- The community of individuals organized by common interest

Individualism - A political philosophy that emphasizes on the freedom of the individual.

2.10 Suggested Readings

If you want to know more on the political philosophy of John Locke , you can go though the following books-

5. J.W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the sixteenth century, London, Methuen, 1967
6. Iain Mclean, Alistair McMillan, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics, Oxford University Press, 2008
7. S.K. Sharma, Urmila Sharma, Western Political Thought, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, new Delhi, 2003
8. Bhandari D.R. *History of European Political Philosophy*, The Bangalore Printing & Publishing Company.
9. Gauba P.O., *Western Political Thought*, Macmillan Publishing India Ltd., 2011.

Possible answer to CYP

(1) (a) Unlike the warlike situation as depicted by Hobbes, Locke's state of nature was a state of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and self-preservation.(b)(i) Two Treaties of Government (ii) Essay Concerning Human Understanding (c) law of nature (d) As an embodiment of reason (d) There are three basic inconveniences faced by the people of the state of nature. Firstly, there was no authority to clarify the laws of nature. Secondly there was no authority to execute the laws of nature and lastly there was no authority to explain the laws of nature. As a result, people often violated the laws of nature interfering the rights of the others.

(2) (a) (i) Contract is unanimous and based on the consent of people (ii) The contract empowered the people to control the government (b) According to Locke, in the state of nature men enjoyed natural rights to life, liberty and property. These rights are inalienable and inviolable for they are derived from the Law of Nature which is God's reason. (c) According to Locke, the object with which one mixes his labour becomes his own property by right (d) There are three important limitations on ownership of property. The first, called "labour-limitation", is that one can appropriate only that much of common resources with which he has mixed his labour. The second limitation, the "sufficiency limitation" enjoins man to appropriate only as much as is required by him and leave "enough and as good for others." The third limitation; known as a 'spoilage limitation', requires that man should acquire a thing only if he can make good use of it, since nothing was made by God for lnan to spoil or destroy. If one takes more, he "invades his neighbour's share" which is prohibited by the law of nature.

(3) (a) Consent (b) to protect the natural rights of the individual (c) if the political authority fails to perform its duty as assigned by thee people, people will have the right to resist (d) Locke spoke of two kinds of consent: express or direct and tacit consent.

References

1. Subrata Mukerjee, Sushila Ramaswami, *A History of Political Thought*, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, Third edition, 2003
2. P.G. Das, *History of Political Thought*, new Central Book Agency, Kolkata, 2014
3. R.C.Gupta, *Great Political Thinkers*, Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal Educational Publishers, Agra, 2002
4. Ian Adams, R.W. Dyson, *Fifty Great Political Thinkers*, Routledge, London,2007
5. S.K. Sharma, Urmila Sharma, *Western Political Thought*, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, new Delhi, 2003
6. Bhandari D.R. *History of European Political Philosophy*, The Bangalore Printing & Publishing Company.
7. Gauba P.O., *Western Political Thought*, Macmillan Publishing India Ltd., 2011.

Model Questions:

1. Elaborate the life and works of John Locke
2. Analyse Locke's views on State of Nature. How his description was different from that of Hobbes?
3. Critically Examine Locke's concept of law of nature.
4. Evaluate the social contract theory propounded by John Locke.
5. Describe Locke's conception of natural rights and private property.
6. Evaluate Locke concept of consent and the right to resistance.
7. Evaluate Locke's contribution towards development of political theory.
8. Analyze Locke as a liberal Political Thinker.

Unit- III

Jean Jacques Rousseau

Structure:

3.0 Objective

After going through this unit you should be able to understand the following concepts:

- Rousseau's view on the State of nature
- Theory of General will
- Rousseau's concept of Popular Sovereignty
- Criticism of the Rousseau's theory of social contract.

3.1 Introduction

Rousseau was born on 28th June, 1712, in Geneva, Switzerland. He was also a composer and music theorist. Though he was born in Geneva but became famous as a French political philosopher and educationist. His work inspired the French Revolution of 1789. He authored a number of significant books. These books are:

Discourse on the Arts and Sciences (1750)
Discourse on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality (1754)
The Social Contract (1762)
Emile (1762)
Confessions (Rousseau) (1782)

Rousseau was mainly famous for his contribution to the social contract theory. But prior to Rousseau, the social contract theory was developed by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Rousseau accepts the social contract theory of his predecessors Hobbes and Locke but obtains conclusions altogether different from them. Rousseau basically tried to conciliate between the individual liberty with the state authority.

3.2 Social contract theory

The theory of social contract is associates with the origin of the state from the liberal point of view. This theory states that the state is the outcome of the mutual agreement of men with a definite purpose to serve some social needs. The main exponents of this theory are Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

Rousseau's theory of social contract can be found in his two significant works namely Discourse on the Origin & Foundations of Inequality (1754) and The Social Contract (1762).

3.2.1 Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality:

The state of nature is the starting point for most social contract theories and Rousseau's social contract theory is also not exception to this. Rousseau also started his theory of the social contract with the description of the state of nature in his notable work 'Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality'. In this book Rousseau draws a fascinating picture of the state of nature. The state of nature is basically an abstract idea considering what human life would look like without a government or a form of organized society.

It must be noted here that Rousseau's state of nature is the hypothetical, prehistoric place and time where men lived an uncorrupted life. He describes men in the state of nature as a 'noble savage'. In the state of nature people lived a life of idyllic blissfulness and primitive simplicity. Further he states that in the state of nature men were equal, self-sufficient and contented. They had a few basic and easily appeased needs. Self-preservation and compassion were the two main instincts of human actions. But this peaceful stage of the state of nature did not last for a long.

Rousseau observed that although life was peaceful in the state of nature but with the passage of time and due to the increasing population situation became changed and inequalities raised their head. Evil, greed and selfishness emerged as

human society began to develop. In this changing environment men became corrupt and unnatural.

Most importantly the invention of private property and divisions of labour led people to make comparisons between themselves and others resulting into shame, envy, pride and contempt. For Rousseau the invention of 'private property' constitutes humanity's fall from grace out of the state of nature. Further he says that this social institution of private property resulted into the emergence of the 'Civil society' which fosters inequality amongst the people. Rousseau asserted that the civil society transforms men from isolated beings with limited wants into the warlike creatures which were found in a Hobbesian state of nature. In other words Rousseau had considered civil society as the state of war. Thus it can be said that in this particular book Rousseau mainly targeted the emergence of civil society and private property as the main cause which resulted into inequality among men and with this negative remark on the civil society Rousseau's Discourse on the origin and foundations of inequality came to an end. In this book he did not make any attempt to provide any solution to get rid of this problem.

3.2.2 The Social Contract

In 'The Social Contract' Rousseau modified his earlier view on the society. In this work he seeks to justify the existence of the society not as a manifestation of inequalities in society but as an instrument for the protection of liberty.

It must be noted here that though Rousseau critiqued civil society but he did not suggest men to choose savage existence. Rousseau realized the fact that society plays a very important role in the development of one's individual self. Therefore Rousseau introduced 'social contract' as an attempt to find a solution to this problem. Social contract is considered as a blueprint through which Rousseau wanted to build an ideal society based on just principles. He says that through the means of social contract men in the state of nature surrendered their all rights not to any particular individual but to themselves. This entire body politic is termed as 'general will' by Rousseau. The general will is the underlying principle of Rousseau's ideal society which helps to assure the liberty and freedom of people.

Rousseau argues that 'general will' is sovereign and supreme. Further he says that the state which came into existence through the social contract is not an arbitrary state rather it is established with a view to maintaining an atmosphere where individuals can enjoy their liberty. In other words the state can said to be the manifestation of general will. Rousseau's state is of organic character because all individuals are an integral part of the state and they will lose their significance when separated from the main body of the state.

Check Your Progress: I

I. How Rousseau portrayed the nature of human being in the state of nature?
II. What are the conditions which made men corrupt in the state of nature?
III. What was the Rousseau's view on the state?

3.3 Theory of General Will

The concept of 'General Will' is at the heart of Rousseau's political philosophy. The term 'general will' was first introduced by Rousseau in his 'Discourse on Political Economy' which he later developed in 'The Social Contract'. Independent, sovereign, infallible and inviolable are some of the main characteristics of Rousseau's general will. Rousseau has defined General will as the aggregate of the real will of all. In other words General will represent the welfare of the whole

community. Rousseau talks about two kinds of will i.e. actual will and real will. Actual will represents the selfish interest of the individuals whereas real will associates with the community good. He further argues that an individual's happiness lies in his real will and not in his actual will. Therefore people should overcome their actual will and follow the direction of their real will.

Since general will is concerned with the well-being of all individuals therefore Rousseau argues that general will is always right and every individual should obey or accept the direction of general will. Rousseau suggests that if anyone refuses to accept general will then he will be forced to do that.

Rousseau's advocacy of general will makes him an ardent supporter of the democracy. Particularly he is considered as the advocator of direct democracy because he did not support the representative form of government. Again Rousseau argues that the general will is not the will of the majority, because majority is a part of the whole but not the whole. David Thompson in his article further claims that the General Will makes Rousseau a great democratic theorist. He argues that sovereignty cannot be surrendered or delegated to any one person or group of people.

Rousseau made a sharp distinction between general will and government. Unlike Hobbes and Locke, in Rousseau's social contract government was not the outcome of the contract rather it was created by the general will. In other words government is just a mere agent to implement and enforce the general will and is composed of small group of citizens. The life of the government depends on the choice of the general will.

Check Your Progress-II

I. What is general will?
II. How general will is formed?
III. What are the features of Rousseau's general will?

3.4 General will and Popular sovereignty

Rousseau's theory of general will is the plea for popular sovereignty. In Rousseau's state, sovereignty originates in the people and that people are the source of power and authority. In other words Rousseau argues that sovereignty should be exercised by people. Like Hobbes, Rousseau also talks about single contract and view sovereign as inalienable, indivisible and infallible. But unlike Hobbes, Rousseau advocates for popular sovereignty. As already mentioned earlier in Rousseau's social contract people surrendered their rights not to any individual but to themselves and this collective body of people is considered as sovereign by Rousseau. Therefore though Rousseau's sovereign is indivisible but it is shared by each member of the society.

It must be noted here that Rousseau's view of sovereignty is the combination of the constitutionalism of Locke and absolutism of Hobbes. For Rousseau absolute power should be vested in the hands of the state but that power must come from the people through the means of general will. He also makes a clear distinction between the sovereign and the government. The government is the representative of the sovereign and its life is solely dependable on the will of the sovereign who can alter the form of government and replace its leaders as it chooses. Rousseau clearly states that the executive and judicial functions have to be exercised by the special organs of government but they are completely subordinate to the sovereign people.

Check Your Progress-III

Q. What is Rousseau's concept of sovereignty?
Q. How Rousseau made distinction between sovereignty and government?

3.5 Assessment of Rousseau's political philosophy

As already mentioned earlier Rousseau's significant contribution towards political philosophy was his social contract theory. But his theory of social contract is not free from criticism. Following are some of the points of criticism of Rousseau's social contract theory:

- Rousseau's theory of social contract is an unhistorical because it does not have any historical base.
- The critics argue that Rousseau's concept of general will is vague and ambiguous. Particularly his distinction between the actual will and real will seems to be logically impossible task.
- Again in his theory of general will Rousseau gave importance to community welfare than the individual welfare.
- Rousseau suggested for forceful action for those who refuse to abide by the general will and it is the clear violation of the spirit of democracy.
- Rousseau advocated for direct democracy. But in modern world due to the excessive increasing population and some other factors the practicability of direct democracy becomes irrelevant and almost all the countries have now adopted indirect democracy.

3.6 Let Us Sum Up

Rousseau was a French political philosopher and was mainly famous for his contribution to the social contract theory. He had developed the theory of social contract in two phases. In the first phase Rousseau critiqued civil society and blamed it for enforcing inequality among men but in the later phase he introduced social contract as a solution for forming an ideal society which is based on just principles. Rousseau argues that through the means of social contract men in the state of nature decided to surrender their rights to themselves and this entire body politic is known as general will. The introduction of the concept of general will is a significant contribution of Rousseau towards the political philosophy. Rousseau has defined general will as the aggregate of the real will of all which associates with the community good.

3.7 Key Words

French Revolution: French revolution lasted for a period of 10 years from 1789 to 1799. Through this revolution people of French overthrew the monarchy and took control of the government.

State of nature: The state of nature is the hypothetical, prehistoric place and time where human beings live prior to the emergence of the state.

Natural rights: Natural rights are universal and inalienable in nature. They exits by virtue of natural law and are not dependent on the laws or customs of any particular culture and government.

Contract: Contract is an agreement with specific terms between two or more persons in which there is a promise to do something in return for a valuable benefit known as consideration.

Sovereignty: The term 'sovereignty' has been derived from the Latin word 'Superanus' which means supreme or paramount. The sovereignty is of two types- external sovereignty and internal sovereignty.

Popular Sovereignty: Popular sovereignty stands for the rule of the people. In other words it means the authority of the state is sustained by the consent of people.

3.8 Suggested Readings

1. O.P Gauba, *An Introduction to Political Theory* (Macmillan Publication, 2013)
2. P. G Das, *History of Political Thought* (New Central Book Agency, 2011)
3. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswami, *A History of Political Thought* (Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 2013)
4. R.C Gupta, *Great Political Thinkers* (Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal Educational Publishers, Agra, 2002)

<u>Possible Answers to CYP</u>:

Answers to CYP-I

1. **Answer:** In Rousseau's theory of the state of nature men were 'noble savage' with some few and easily appeased needs. They were equal, self-sufficient and contended. Compassion and self-preservation were the two main instincts of their actions.
2. **Answer:** Rousseau argues that the invention of private property and the emergence of civil society made the men corrupt and unnatural in the state of nature.
3. **Answer:** Rousseau asserts that the state came into existence as the manifestation of the general will.

Answers to CYP-II

1. **Answer:** General will is said to be the heart of Rousseau's political philosophy. He has defined general will as the sum total of the real will of all individuals.
2. **Answer:** In Rousseau's social contract men in the state of nature entered into a contract and decided to surrender their rights to themselves and this entire body politic is known as general will.
3. **Answer:** Independent, indivisible, inviolable and sovereign are the main features of Rousseau's general will.

Answers to CYP-III

1. **Answer:** Unlike Hobbes and Locke, Rousseau advocated for popular sovereignty. He argues that the sovereignty originates in people and they are the real source of power and authority.
2. **Answer:** Rousseau has distinguished sovereignty from the government. For Rousseau people are the sovereign but the government is the mere agent of the sovereign and its life is solely dependent on the will of sovereign.

References

1. O.P Gauba, *An Introduction to Political Theory* (Macmillan Publication, 2013)
2. P. G Das, *History of Political Thought* (New Central Book Agency, 2011)
3. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswami, *A History of Political Thought* (Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 2013)

Web References:

4. www.gradesaver.com>study-guide.su, Retrieved on 21/09/2017
5. www.academia.edu.social_contract_theory, Retrieved on 19/09/2017
6. www.preservearticles.com>brief-essay, Retrieved on 28/09/2017
7. www.focusias.com>b-general-will-rouss, Retrieved on 25/09/2017
8. https://www.ukessays.com>philosophy, Retrieved on 22/09/2017

Model Question

Q. How Rousseau depicted the life of men in the state of nature?

Q. Write a note on the Rousseau's social contract theory?

Q. Critically Examine Rousseau's theory of general will?

BLOCK - 4

UNIT-I

JEREMY BENTHAM

Structure:

1.0 Objectives:

After Going through this unit, you will be able to-

- Understand the life and works of Jeremy Bentham
- Narrate the influences on him that shaped his political thinking
- Define Utilitarianism.
- Describe other major ideas of Bentham
- Evaluate Bentham as a socio-political reformer

1.1 Introduction:

This unit will deal with the contribution of Jeremy Bentham in the realm of political thought. Here, we are discussing on the principle of 'utilitarianism', the most important concept developed by Bentham and will also have analysis on some other important ideals and issues of Bentham's political thought. The unit describes Bentham's notions on State, Law, Political reform, Democracy and other issues like Gender, Economy, Homosexuality and Animal Rights in brief.

1.2 Brief review of Life and Works of Bentham:

Jeremy Bentham (15 Feb 1748-6 june1832) was an English Philosopher, Jurist, socio-political reformer and activist, who exclusively controlled the English political thought for more than a century. Bentham had a varied interest in socio-political issues, but he is most widely and specifically known for his doctrine of 'utilitarianism'. In fact, the doctrine of utilitarianism is so intrinsically associated with Bentham that one can't be separated from another. Bentham was born to a very wealthy family of lawyers and there was a obvious conducive environment for learning. He was the elder son of an attorney, Jeremiah Bentham and his first wife, Alicia Whitehorn, and brother to Samuel, a naval architect and diplomat. Though his mother died very early when he was just ten years old , Bentham's father very strictly monitored his activities and ensured that he receives a good education. Bentham is often termed as a child prodigy who started learning Latin at the age of three. He went to West minister School for basic education and later to the Queen's College, Oxford where he completed his bachelor's degree in 1763 and Master's degree in 1766. Bentham's later interest in educational reform was stimulated by his unhappy experiences at Westminster School (1755–60) and Queen's College, Oxford (BA 1763, MA 1766). He described Westminster as "a wretched place for instruction", while his three years at Queen's, which he entered at the age of twelve, were no more stimulating. He viewed the Oxbridge colleges as seats of privilege, prejudice and idleness, and his Oxford experience left him with a deep distrust of oaths and sparked a general antipathy toward the Anglican establishment.

As a family profession, he was also trained in law but soon became deeply frustrated with the complexity of the English Legal Code and termed it as a 'Demon of Chicane'. Though Bentham was interested in all the domains of social science and humanities viz, Economics, Logic, Psychology, Penology, Theology, Ethics and Politics-but mainly he was keen to learn the activities of Judicial department and public administration. Bentham has enriched the domain of political thought and theory by writing extensively on utilitarianism, legal positivism and liberalism. Prominent works by Jeremy Bentham include-The Principles of Morals and Legislation(1789), ,A Fragment On Government(1776) , Drought of a Code for the organisation of the Judicial System of France(1790),Anarchical Fallacies(1791), Discourse on Civils and Penal Legislation,(1802),The Limits of Jurisprudence(1802), Indirect Legislation(1802), A Theory of Punishment and Rewards(1811), A Treaties of

Judicial Evidence(1813),Papers Upon Codification of Public Instruction(1817) ,The Book of Fallacies(1824) and Rational of Evidence(1827) which was later edited by J.S Mill.

1.3 Influences on Bentham:

Benthamite political philosophy was influenced by many personalities and school of thoughts. Bentham was influenced by the ideals of 'Philosophical Radicals'-a school that believed in preparing a scheme on legal economic and political reform aiming at the greatest happiness of the greatest number. His philosophy was also inspired by 'Classical Hedonism'-a school which believed in the utility of the pleasure factor. He was also influenced by individualism though he associated it with the happiness of the majority. More than these ideologies, he was influenced by Protagoras, Epicuras, John Locke, David Hume, Montesque, Helvetius, Hobbes, Beccaria and Adam Smith.

On the other hand, his political philosophy influenced personalities like David Recardo, John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidwick, Miche Foucault, Peter Singer, John Austin, Robert Owen, H.L.A Hart, George Grote and Francis Y. Edgeworth. Bentham was so influential during his time that he not only inspired the political and legislative process of his own country but also motivated movements and revolutions all over the world. He was made an honorary citizen of revolutionary France, while the Guatemalan leader José del Valle acclaimed him as "the legislator of the world". Never before or since has the English-speaking world produced a more politically engaged and internationally influential thinker across such a broad range of subjects. The first constitutions of the independent republic of Colombia owed as much to Bentham as do modern theories of animal rights.

1.4 Doctrine of Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism dominated the European political thought for a long period and still finds its relevancy in the academic discourses all over the world. Utilitarianism is an ethical doctrine that believes actions are right if they are useful or for the benefit of a majority. It believes that best action is that which maximizes utility. The theory states that 'result' or the 'consequence' of an act is the real measure of whether it is good or bad. This theory emphasizes 'Ends over Means'. The theories like 'utilitarianism' which emphasizes on the results or the consequences is called teleological or consequentialist theory. The interpreters and the critics define utilitarianism as a two way doctrine i.e., as an ethical theory and a practical movement. As an ethical theory, it means universal hedonism which believes that it is unethical or immoral to force a man to accept something which is painful to him/her. The doctrine advocates that man should be left alone to decide what he will receive or reject. It is also termed as a practical movement in a sense that before taking any decision or enacting a law, the government must evaluate its utility to the people. Utilitarianism believes that life of mankind is regulated by two basic ideologies viz, idealism and realism. Though man adores idealism but practically realism has more importance in human life. Though, ideally people are subject to both the principles of pain and pleasure but in reality they always prefer pleasure in life and perform every action to attain pleasure. Utilitarian thinkers are also termed as the 'Philosophical Radicals' who provided the structure for early liberalism. The philosophical radicals were more interested in practical programmed of legal, political and economic reforms aiming at the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' rather than doctrines and ideals. Utilitarianism believes that man is a creature of multiple interests and is the bundle of

diverse attitudes and principles that may be contradictory many a times. This is because, man always wants to gain pleasure, in fact he/she is a pleasure seeking and pain avoiding creature. The philosophy also believes that individuals should be permitted to do activities in their own terms because they are rational creatures.

Though, utilitarianism is being interchangeably used with Bentham's political philosophy, but it is not his discovery. Bentham didn't use the term 'utilitrianism' but utilitarian principle found its best exposition in the hands of Bentham. Benthamite utilititarinism is described as the 19th century revision of classical hedonism of Epicurus. In the sphere of political philosophy Hobbes has a direct influence upon the utilitarian school of thought. Utilitarians like Hobbes regard the state as a means of reconciling man's selfish interest with the society. The difference between Hobbes and the Utilitarians is that the later unlike the former wants to restrict the powers of the state and the government. Hume also influenced the utilitarian political thought to a great extent. According to John PLamenatz , David Hume is the founder of utilitarianism. Hume maintained that men normally approve of those states of mind or actions which are pleasant or means to pleasure, and disapprove of those that are harmful or a means to pain. Hume believed that man primarily attaches importance to 'pain' and 'pleasure' and avoids all that is painful. Besides Hobbes and Hume, in Locke's philosophy of morality has certain trait of utilitarianism.

1.5 Political ideas of Bentham

As you are already aware of the fact that Bentham was a person of diverse interest ranging from economics to animal rights, so it is obvious that he also expressed his views on multiple issues and areas. Though he is primarily associated with the philosophy of utilitarianism but his views on State, Democracy, Law and jurisprudence and other socio-economic and environmental issues also have equally important space in academic analysis. In the following content, we will discuss Bentham's major political concepts and views one by one.

1.5.1 Bentham's contribution to Utilitarianism

Bentham is the greatest and the best interpreter of the theory of utilitarianism and thus is often termed as the father of utilitarian philosophy. In 1776, he first announced himself to the world as a proponent of utility as the guiding principle of conduct and law in *A Fragment on Government*. In *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (printed 1780, published 1789), as a preliminary to developing a theory of penal law he detailed the basic elements of classical utilitarian theory .The principle of utilitarianism, in Benthamite interpretation mean 'greatest good of the greatest number'. This meaning of utilitarianism was drawn by Bentham from 'Priestley's Essay on Government'. Though, Bentham didn't actually invented the term 'utilitarianism' but the credit of Bentham lies on the fact that he made the utilitarian philosophy popular and established its acceptability. Russell has rightly said that Bentham's significant contribution is located not in the doctrine of utilitarianism but in his vigorously applying it to many political programmes. His clear view was that each and every government, when announcing any policy and or taking any decision or implementing any action must remember that whether and to what extent the proposed policy or action is capable of maximizing comfort or pleasure of the people .At the beginning of the his work 'An introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation', Bentham states-"Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters-pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right

and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think….".The principle of utility (or the greatest happiness principle) advocates that the cause of all human action, that which motivates human beings to act, is a desire for pleasure. Bentham defines utility in terms of pleasure i.e., only those acts/things which creates pleasure has utility. In this context, "utility means that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit/advantage, pleasure/good or happiness". The principle of utility is concerned with results and not with motives. It means whatsoever is the motive, the result of every action should be beneficial or pleasure oriented. For Bentham, utilitarianism was both a descriptive and normative theory-it is not only described how human beings act so as to maximize pleasure and minimize pain, but it also prescribed or advocated such action. Bentham opined that the there are four distinguishable sources from which pleasure and pain are in use to flow. These sources in Bentham's analysis can be termed as physical, the political, the moral and the religious. These can also be termed as sanctions. The physical or natural sanctions comprise the pains and pleasure, which is realized in a natural way and can't be purposefully modified by any human interposition. The moral sanction comprises such pains and pleasures which we experience or expect in the hands of our fellows prompted by feelings of hatred and goodwill or contempt or regard. Political sanctions are those sanctions that we experience or expect at the hands of magistracy acting under law. This can also be termed as legal sanction. On the other hand, religious sanction includes such pains and pleasures as we may experience or expect in virtue of the forebodings and promises of religion.

According to Bentham, for an individual the value of pleasure depends on four circumstances-intensity, certainty or uncertainty and proximity or remoteness. These circumstances should be considered in estimating pain and pleasure. But when the value of pleasure or pain is considered for the purpose of estimating the tendency of any act by which it is produced, another two factors come into account in this regard – these are fecundity and its purity.

Bentham conceived that utility of a particular action or thing can be gauged or calculated by following a specific method. This method is described as 'felicific calculas' or 'hedonistic calculas'. According to Bentham, as both pleasure and pain are calculable they can be summed up. The balance will determine what is pain and what is pleasure. Felicific calculus proposes a method in which numerical value can be attached to intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty and propinquity or remoteness. He proposed a classification of 12 pains and 14 pleasures by which we can evaluate the 'happiness factor' or pleasure or 'sadness factor' or pain of any action. The 14 pleasures defined by Bentham are-1.The pleasure of sense 2.The pleasures of wealth 3.The pleasures of skill 4.The pleasures of amity 5.The pleasures of good name 6.The pleasures of power7.The pleasures of piety 8.The pleasures of benevolence 9.The pleasures of malevolence 10.The pleasures of memory 11.The pleasures of imagination 12The pleasure of expectation 13.The pleasures dependent on association 14.The pleasures of relief. On the other hand the 12 factors that give pain for which individual wants to avoid are borne out of factors food, liquor, thirst, drought, inanition, briery, sexual desire etc.

1.5.2 Bentham's views on Legislation and Legislative Reforms:

You have already read that Bentham was a man of jurisprudence. Bentham was called to the Bar in 1769, but his legal career lasted only one brief year. In that

year he discovered the utility principle and related ideas in the writings of Hume, Helvétius and Beccaria and chose instead a career dedicated to analytic jurisprudence, law reform, and social and political improvement. Though he didn't practiced law as a profession even after being invited to join the bar, but he was always eager to study jurisprudence because of his deep attachment to the subject. Thus, naturally legislation and legislative reforms acquire important space and add credit to his political philosophy. The penal code was to be the first in a collection of codes that would constitute the utilitarian '*pannomion'*, a complete body of law based on the utility principle, the development of which was to engage Bentham in a lifetime's work and was to include civil, procedural, and constitutional law. He argues that the principle of utility should be applied even in the law making process and individual's obligation to law is to be determined by its capacity to satisfy the utility. So, law is to be enacted in such a way as to fulfill this basic demand. Thus, the person who takes initiative in the enactment of law must know the people's requirements. According to Bentham the legislator has a great role in increasing the utility of public policy and providing pleasure to the people. To quote Bentham, 'The end and aim of legislator should be the happiness of the people. In matters of legislation, general utility should be his guiding principle. The science of legislation consists in determining what makes for the good of a particular community whose interest is at the stake…"As such the legislator is the most effective instrument for realizing the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Conceiving the legislator as a person having great responsibility, Bentham prescribed the qualities like intelligence and skillfulness for him. Bentham preferred legislations over customs and opined that only in special circumstances; the legislator should permit customs and habits to exercise. It is because, in Bentham's belief human history is full of crimes and follies of mankind. So, the habits and customs behind which there was no reason and which were not governed by principle of utility could not be the basis of scientific jurisprudence. Utility gives law a scientific character and establish it as a positive one. Bentham opined that utility of legislation can be measured in terms of effectiveness, the cost of its enforcement and in general by its consequences. Thus, it is possible to judge the advantage and disadvantage of a particular law and prevent undesirable activities and enhances the scope of pleasure.

1.5.3 The Panopticon:

Bentham advocated for the establishment of a model prison named as 'Panopticon' which can be regarded as concrete shape of the theory of punishment. It was an institutional structure which Bentham wanted to establish for the British government as a part of reform in the field of law and punishment. After long persuasion in the year 1790, the British government allotted a piece of land on which Bentham was to supervise the construction of the model prison but unfortunately the project was abandoned in the year 1802. The concept of the design of Panopticon was to allow all (pan-) inmates of an institution to be observed (-opticon) by a single watchman without the inmates being able to know whether or not they are being watched. Bentham wanted that the design of panopticon should be applied to all disciplinary institutions like school, hospitals, asylums, factory or military barracks. The design of the panopticon consted of a circular structure with an 'inspection house' at its centre, from where the inspector can watch the residents of the house, who are stationed at the perimeter. The idea of panopticon is still relevant when we emphasize on watching the movements of people with the installation of CCTV cameras. In this regard, Michel Foucalt credits Bentham for creating a new technology for power.

According to Foucalt, “The panopticon represents one central moment in the history of repression-the transition from inflicting penalties to the imposition of surveillance.

The Panopticon was not completed as it was later abandoned, but the idea of an institution based on a scientific and liberal system of monitoring and surveillance had far reaching impact for the future. Bentham conceived the panopticon where his idea of ‘felicific calculas’ could be used as it was a place where ‘pain ‘ and ‘pleasure’ of the inmates could be measured with a system of continuous observation .Moreover, the idea of Panopticon also demands for a system where instead of applying cruel and repressive measures to control the prisoners or inmates, they should be controlled psychologically and mentally by creating a fear that they are being continuously watched and any of their inappropriate action can call for punitive action for them.

1.5.4. Bentham’s Ideas on State:

In Benthamite political thought ‘state is a group of persons organized for the promotion and maintenance of utility that is to achieve greatest happiness or pleasure of the greatest number.’ In the book, the Fragment on Government, Bentham criticized Blackstone who praised the English law as a slow, natural growth in accordance with divine providence. He further attacked Blackstone for basing political obligation to an original contract. Bentham thus renounces the ‘social contract theory’ about the origin of the state. Bentham viewed the state as a material entity whose objective should be to deliver benefits and pleasures. Bentham maintains that the end of the state is the promotion of utility and thus the aim of the state is identical to the interest of the individual. Bentham and other utilitarian thinkers place the state in an exceptional and unique position because the state is the sole source of law, which is the most certain of ‘all sanctions’ which govern the lives of the man. The state in Bentham’s opinion is primarily a law making body, a group of persons organized for the promotion and maintenance of happiness and acting through law to the end. The state has to provide utility to its citizens in terms of pleasure by adopting proper and adequate laws and executing them. A law, in Bentham’s belief is the expression of will in the form of command. As law is a command, it must be the command of the supreme authority. Thus, Bentham’s state is a sovereign state, it is the hallmark of a sovereign state. This sovereign state as conceived by Bentham do nothing wrong and illegal but is an institution that satisfies the need of individuals. The ends of legislation according to Bentham are security, subsistence, abundance and equality. In simple terms, it can be said that the ultimate aim of state is to increase the happiness of the people by enacting proper laws. It is important for the state to ensure people’s participation in the process of enactment and execution of law to secure loyalty and obligation. Otherwise ‘unwilling obedience and general dissatisfaction’ will cause ultimate revolution. It is important to mention that Bentham justified opposition to obedience. Bentham’s notion of state can be termed as a negative state because he argues that the objective of the state is to fulfill the requirements of the people. Bentham’s state is a democratic one and the end of the state is to provide benefits to the people by applying democratic means and methods. Thus it can be undoubtedly opined that the people are prior to the state, unlike the views of Plato, Aristotle and many other thinkers who assume the state as a priority in comparison to the individual.

1.5.5. **Bentham’s ideas on Democracy**:

Bentham wanted a powerful state that can fulfill the needs and requirement of citizens and increase the amount of their pleasure and happiness. But his notion of a strong state doesn’t mean that Bentham was an advocate of autocracy or despotic state.

Bentham was an advocate of democratic state where power is in the hands of the people .He never believed in the idea of natural rights and spoke about the rights created by the state. This again means that he believed in equality. In the democratic state that was visualized by Bentham, every individual had the right to claim greatest happiness and it is the primary duty of every state to fulfill the claim of the individual, otherwise their will be no worth and utility of the state. Bentham talked about two kinds of equality i.e., one man's happiness must count for as much as another's and secondly, every man is apt to be the best judge of his own interest which is a sort of natural equality. Such ideas on rights and equality make Bentham a democrat in the true sense of the term. Bentham wanted a limited government which will least interfere in the matters of individuals. The state and government, in Bentham's conviction can't control all the spheres of individual's life in an effective and positive way. He believed that a powerful state can't ensure the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Bentham believed in the reign of the people and suggested a representative form of government. As Bentham believed that individuals are rational enough to judge good and bad or fair or unfair so they can also capably elect their representatives. Only a representative democratic system can reconcile individual's interest with the interest of the community. Moreover, a representative government will try to increase the happiness of the people by adopting steps for general welfare, because if the government will fail to do so, the people will make a change in the government through the mechanism of election. Bentham not only suggested for a representative democracy but also argued for some other radical reforms in the democratic process viz, reforms in the electoral process, votes for women, annual parliament and secret ballot system.

1.6 Bentham and Gender issues:

Bentham advocated for women's rights more than a decade before Mary Wollstonecraft and other feminist. Though scholars accept Bentham as a political and legal reformer and the chief advocate of doctrine of utilitarianism, but he was a feminist who advocated for the liberation of women community much before the period when issues of gender justice attained the recognition as subjects of academic discourse. Bentham advocated women liberation from actual and virtual slavery which was prevalent at many countries at that time. He emphasized for a total emancipation of the women community covering political freedom, personal freedom and physical and sexual freedom. He argued for political freedom of women that would allow women to exercise their franchise and clear the path to participate in the political and executive process of the government. Personal freedom will entitle the women community to take decisions on issues related to marriage, children and divorce. Physical freedom, on the other hand provides the women community to become decisive on matters of their body and movement which in turn will help to have free access to assets and resources. Jeremy Bentham's writings on the law of marriage address contemporary Enlightenment debates on marriage. These debates are concerned the secularization of marriage, natural law, and distinctions between law and morals and between nature and culture. Bentham drafted a law of marriage based on the principle of utility and on the proposition that men and women were equal. Bentham's utilitarian views of sexual relations are made particularly clear in his writings on wives and mistresses, and in his radical suggestions for short-term marriage. His writings on the law of marriage are firmly based on the principle of utility, the 'greatest happiness principle'. As you know the 'the greatest happiness

principle' asserts that all human actions are motivated by a wish to avoid pain and gain pleasure, so in regard of sex and marriage also, Bentham wanted to avoid the problems and increase happiness .Bentham placed sexual love, which he described as physical desire, in the category of 'self-regarding' motives for human behavior, along with 'pecuniary interest', love of power, and self preservation. Therefore in the course of drafting a utilitarian law of marriage Bentham made a detailed explanation of the pleasures and pains of sexual love. His discussions were not confined within the terms of legal marriage and into the realm of what would today be described as gender relations. His discourse on gender included homosexual, heterosexual, monogamous relations or otherwise, within or outside of marriage relations. Bentham's views on sex and the principle of utility can be clearly understood from his writings on wives, prostitutes and mistresses. It is very important to mention here that to increase the benefit of the institution of marriage and to have pleasure of sex , Bentham made his radical suggestion for short-term marriages.In 1802 Étienne Dumont, Bentham's friend and editor, published Bentham's *Traités de Législation Civile et Pénale* in Paris. This included some parts of Bentham's law of marriage in Bentham's.

1.7 Bentham as a Reformer:

In the introductory part of this chapter, an effort is being made to introduce you to the multifaceted personality of Jeremy Bentham who embraced issues relating to society, politics, economy, gender and many other areas in his academic discussions. Indeed, Bentham was a reformer with dedicated spirit and enthusiasm who wanted to make all round development of the society. He, at length discussed about reforming constitutional law to international law in his writings. Likewise, he argued for reforms in prison to penal law, electoral system to ballot, rights of the women to the rights of the homosexual. He was a visionary utilitarian who attempted to increase happiness of the people by positively reforming the aspects of human life and society which he perceived erroneous or imperfect. Bentham also opined for reforms in monetary economics and advocated for a system, what we call 'welfare economics' in modern times. In 'A defence of Usery (1787), his first book on economics, Bentham rejected Adam Smith's defense of a legal maximum for interest rates. Bentham argued that Smith's stand was inconsistent with general advocacy of freedom of trade and would restrict economic growth and national prosperity by deterring investment and innovation. Bentham was also developed interest in foreign policy and international law in succeeding times. Indeed, "international" was a term coined by Bentham. He drafted short papers on several topics that were later published under the general title Principles of International Law. Bentham was a true animal lover and advocated for animal rights. In fact, Bentham is widely recognized and respected as one of the early advocated of animal rights and regarded as 'the first patron saint of animal rights'. He argued that the ability to suffer, not the ability to reason ,should be the benchmark or what he called the 'insuperable line'.

1.8 Critical evaluation of Bentham's philosophy:

Though Bentham's dominance in the realm of English political thought was undisputed almost for two centuries and he has been influencing the course of political thought till the recent times, but his ideas and notions are not out of criticism. He is being criticized for not inventing any original principle or propounding any theory that could really contribute to political thought. Wayper remarks "He took his theory of knowledge from Locke and Hume, the pleasure and pain principle from Helvetius, the notion of sympathy and antipathy from Hume, the idea of utility from any half of a

score of writers. Lacking originality and full of prejudice in his speculations, he is as confused and contradictory …"Maxey criticizes Bentham's psychology as inadequate and opines that his reconciliation of individual and community satisfactions unsuccessful. He is being criticized for not going deep into human psychology and judging it only on the basis of pain and pleasure. Critic opines that Bentham lacked intellectual capacity to draw a comprehensive picture of human psychology and human nature. He is being criticized for supporting the bourgeoisie or the middle class with his doctrine of pain and pleasure because Bentham never mentioned anything against massive industrialization. However, it is very important to appraise the contributions of Bentham, though he is being criticized very much for his inadequate ideas and philosophy.

1.9 Let Us Sum Up:

From the precedent discussion, we can very plainly perceive the personality and role of Jeremy Bentham. He was a dynamic man who played multiple roles of political scientist, economist, feminist thinker, legal –constitutional reformer and so on and so forth. Bentham is chiefly acknowledged and known for his contribution towards utilitarianism. Though the term 'utilitarian' was originally coined by Epicurus but Bentham is regarded as the father of utilitarianism. The worth of Bentham can be evaluated from the fact that though there are other prominent authorities of utilitarian school like J.S Mill, the former's credit lies on the fact that he applied the principle of utilitarianism to numerous facets and aspects of society and politics. By applying the principle of utility he wanted to increase the 'greatest happiness of greatest number'. He wanted to provide a happy and good life to the people by making positive changes and reforms in every sphere of socio-political and even in personal –individual life Bentham was a modern thinker in the true spirit because his ideas and opinions are even relevant in the contemporary times. His views on gender and sexuality, animal rights, jail reforms etc are receiving massive importance and relevance in the modern times. Bentham, much ahead of his time and circumstances spoke on welfare economy, effective and prudent administration and many other democratic ideas.

1.10 Key Words:

Utilitarianism: Utilitarianism is an ethical philosophy that emphasizes on the happiness of the greatest number of people of the society. This philosophy beliefs that any action that yield to benefit or can increase pleasure and happiness of people can be conceived as morally correct.

Benthamite: philosophy: The totality of socio-political and reformative ideas based on utilitarianism aimed at making changes in all the aspects of human life.

Panopticon: A detailed institutional system to observe and punish prisoners, a kind of reformative jail visualized by Bentham

1.11 Suggested Readings:

1. Paul Fairfield ,Moral Selfhood in Liberal Tradition :The Politics of Individuality, University of Toronto Press,2000.
2. Francisco vergara, Bentham and Mill on the 'Quality' of Pleasures, Revue d'etudes benthamiennes, Paris, 2011
3. Everett Charles W, 'Jeremy Bentham' Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London,1966
4. Parekh Bhikhu (ed.), Jeremy Bentham: Critical Assessment, Routledge, London, 1993
5. Semple Jenet, Bentham's Prison:A study of the Panopticon Penitentiary, Clerendon Press, London, 1993

Model Question

1. Briefly write on the life and work of Bentham
2. Discuss the doctrine of utilitarianism as developed by Bentham.
3. Critically evaluate the contribution of Jeremy Bentham towards modern political thought.
4. Analyze the role of Bentham as a socio-political reformer.
5. What is panopticon? Discuss the concept of panopticon as conceived by Bentham

Unit – II
John Stuart Mill

Structure :

2.0 Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able to –

- Highlight the life history, philosophical ideas, and political contribution of J.S. Mill
- Discuss the Utilitarian Principles and its social importance
- Evaluate the ideas of State and Socialism principles of the State.
- Examine the ideas of Individual liberty
- Analyze the views of representative government and rights of Women

2.1 Introduction

In the previous unit you have studied the philosophy of Jeremy Bentham and his political ideas you have already studied the various aspects of Bentham's political philosophy, the idea of the nature of government and views on state, law and liberty. In this unit, you will study the political ideas of J.S; Mill and his political contribution towards Nation.

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) was the most influential political thinker of the nineteenth century. Mill's transformation criticism of Bentham's utilitarian principles and it was one of his greatest contributions to political thought he argued that the principles of greatest happiness of the greatest number were defensible only if a distinction was made between happiness and pleasure He also replaced the quantitative approach of Bentham by a qualitative one Moreover, in his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissez faire to an active role for the State from a negative to a positive conception of liberty. He accepted the notion that an individual did not develop in isolation for the flowering of a vibrant culture, healthy discourse, diversity and a concern for public affairs, liberty of expression assumed special significance. He saw the need for a liberal society as a basic precondition of a liberal state and representative government. He was a staunch enemy of despotism and monocracy and a great supporter of demociacy. Mill regarded representative democracy as necessary for progress as it permitted citizens to develop their best practices. He accepted that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty could give legitimacy to the government. Unlike many contemporary liberals, he also advocated women's rights seeing sexual inequality as ethically and legally untenable.

This unit introduces the life history of Mill, his political thoughts and his principles of liberalism. Mill was one of the foremost individualists of all times. He ranked with Rousseau, Jefferson and Milton as an ardent crusader of individual liberty. He humanized utilitarian philosophy also. The unit also highlights women's Question regarding political and sexual equality for women. In addition you will also learn about the role of State and concept of representative government.

2.2 A Brief life Sketch of J.S. Mill

John Stuart Mill was born in London on May 20, 1806. The name of his father was James Mill. His father came from Scotland with the desire to become a writer but he became a journalist and then concentrated on writing. He wrote 'History of British India' which took him 11 years to complete. After publication of this book he was appointed as an assistant examiner at the East India House. James Mill decided to teach his son all by himself at home. His education did not include any children's books or toys. He started his educational career to learn Greek at the age of 4 (four) and Latin at 8 (eight) under the supervision of his father. At the age of 10, he had read many of Plato's dialogues, logic and history. He was familiar with the writings of Euripides, Homer, Polybius, Scphocles and Thucydides. He could also solve problem

in algebra, geometry, differential calculus and higher mathematics. At the age of 13, he was introduced to serious reading of the English classical economists and political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. When Mill was 14 years old he went to France with Samuel Bentham, brother of Jeremy Bentham, where he learnt the French language and studied higher mathematics, chemistry and botany. He also stayed with the noted economist Jean Baptists in Paris. At the age of 15, he went to Britain and studied psychology and attended a series of lectures delivered on Jurisprudence by John Austin. All his learning came from his father. At the age of 20, J.S. Mill started to write for newspaper and periodicals. Like his father, he got the post of assistant examiner in 1823 and served the British government until 1858. Most of his great literary output was produced when he held a full-time job. Between the years 1865 and 1868 Mill served as Lord Rector of the University of St. Andrews. During the same period, he was a Member of Parliament for the City of Westminster and often remained associated with the Library Party. During his time as a Member of Parliament, Mill advocated easing the burdens on Ireland and in 196 became the first person in the Parliament to call for women to be given the right to vote. Mill became a strong advocate of women's rights and social reforms such as labour unions and farm cooperatives. He called for various reforms of the Parliament especially proportional representation, the Single Transferable Vote, and the extension of suffrage.

No doubt, be was a gifted child. But in his Autobiography, he claims that the rigorous and exhaustive study that he had an effect on mental and physical health at a young age. In his autobiography, he also acknowledged that his father's contribution in shaping his mental abilities and physical strength to the extent that he never had a normal boyhood. In his autobiography, he also acknowledged that the important works on Liberty and The Subjection of Women were joint endeavourers with Harriet Hardy Taylor. Later on, Mill married Harriet and described her as the honour and chief blessing of his existence a source of great inspiration for his attempts to bring about human improvement.

John Stuart Mill was the most influential political thinker of the nineteenth century. In his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissez faire top an active role for the State from a negative to positive conception of liberty. He was also a proponent of utilitarianism, an ethical theory developed by Jeremy Bentham although his conception of it was very different with Mill. In his thinking, he was greatly influenced by the dialogues and dialectics of Plato and the cross-questioning of Socrates. From his philosophical understandings, Mill was liberal, at the same time as a reluctant democrat, a pluralist, a cooperative socialist, an elitist and a feminist.

His famous works are: System of logic (1843), Principles of Political Economy (1848), Essay on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy, On Liberty (1859), Considerations on Representative Government (1861). Utilitarianism (1865). Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (1863) and The Subjection of Women (1869).

2.3 The Utilitarian Principles

Mill's most important philosophical contribution was Utilitarian Principles. In this regard he wrote a book 'Utilitarianism' in 1859. In this book, Mill criticized and modified Bentham's Utilitarianism. He asserted that the chief deficiency of Bentham's ethics was the neglect of individual character and hence stressed on the cultivation of feelings and imagination as part of good life. Mill viewed that the principle of utility as a valid psychology of human behavior and as the basis of moral rules. So, poetry,

drama, music, painting was essential ingredients both for human happiness and formation of character. He defined happiness to mean perfection of human nature, cultivation of moral virtues and lofty aspirations total control over one's appetites and desires and recognition of individual and collective interests. Mill's major contribution to utilitarianism was his argument for the qualitative separation of pleasures. Bentham treats all forms of happiness as equal, whereas Mill argues that intellectual and moral pleasures (higher pleasures) are superior to more physical forms of pleasure (lower pleasures). Bentham utilitarian principles are that all pleasures are equivalent in that they can be quantitatively compared. The values Bentham employs in his felicific calculus such as duration, intensify, fecundity are all quantitative. Bentham assumes that given the choice between two or more pleasures, the best one can be determined by balancing these values against each other on the basis of intensify of another. But Mill viewed that the pleasurable has a qualitative as well as quantitative dimension. This means that some pleasures are qualitatively superior to others no matter how quantitatively intense of those others may be. It is not impossible to measure quality because quality never be compared to quantity. In this regard, Mill analysed with an example that we face a choice between spending our lives in the acquisition of wealth and property and devoting ourselves to philosophical pursuits. The philosophical understanding of the life of mind is qualitatively more pleasurable than a life spent in economic activity alone. There is no any quantitative distinction if it increase our economic well-being or wealthy because the intellectual life always remains superior. The philosopher will always be happier than the capitalist no matter how successful the capitalist may be. So, Mill argues that higher pleasures access higher abilities and capacities in humans such as intellectual prosperity, whereas lower pleasures would mean bodily or temporary pleasures. It must be admitted that when utilitarian writers have said that mental pleasures are better than bodily ones they have mainly based this on mental pleasures being more permanent, safer, less costly from their circumstantial advantages rather than from their intrinsic nature. Because of this factor, Mill's own definition of utilitarianism shows the differences from other definitions of Utilitarianism. Mill also pointed out that human action and human consciences as part of the psychological attributes of a person. In this regard, Mill mentioned three aspects, the moral aspect i.e. right and wrong, the aesthetic aspect i.e. beauty and the sympathetic aspect i.e. loveableness. From these aspects, Mill reviewed the utilitarian principles as regarded individual self-development and diversity as the ultimate ends, important components of human happiness and the principal ingredients and social progress.

The philosophical understanding of Mill Utilitarian principles criticized with some questions. Mill's distinction between quantitative and qualitative pleasures is no mere academic exercise in moral philosophy. This distinction cannot be considered in democratic society. Democratic people's erroneous belief that their opinions are as valid as anyone else's is precisely what lies behind the specter of majority tyranny. It is the key problem with democratic people is their inability to understand that their idea of happiness is an illusion, a shadow in the cave world of opinion.

2.4 Individual Liberty:

J.S. Mill's Essay 'On Liberty' is one of the most important works of his philosophical contribution toward society and also individual. It was published in 1859. Mill defended the right of individual and freedom of expression. He stated that governed the actions of society and the individual in the way of compulsion and

control. It means that society has no right to coerce an unwilling individual, except for self-defense. It means that the greatest amount of freedom for the pursuit of the individual's creative impulses and energies and for self-development. Mill contended that society could limit individual liberty to prevent harm to other people. In this regard, he identifies three major areas –freedom of thought and expression, freedom of action, and freedom of association. He advocates these areas to protect the individual liberty on the ground of human dignity. So, Mill defended individual liberty to ensure fullest development of his personality.

Mill advocates liberty of thought and expression on the ground of human dignity. He viewed that individual self-determination is a basic human right. The need for intellectual freedom becomes more urgent with the extension of democracy. In a democracy, it is realized that public opinion is the source of intellectual authority. In regards of the freedom of action and freedom of association, Mill conceded certain restrictions on these freedoms so that no one is allowed to harm or injure any other person. It meant self-development and freely expressed the individual will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. Mill advocates that freedom does not mean that it affects the tcommunity and hamper to the freedom of individual.

On Liberty, Mill expressed that all creative faculties and the great goods of life could develop only through freedom and individual liberty. So, he believed in the individual's capacity for education by which not only intellectual training or cultivation of critical enquiry but also the training of individual character. He regarded individual character as a result of civilization, instruction, education and culture. These should be nurtured to empower human abilities and cultivate to human being for happiness. So, Liberty was regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for leading a good, worthy, and dignified life.

It is generally believed that Mill's essay' On. Liberty' was written to defend the idea of negative liberty and propagate positive liberty. Mill understood liberty not only as involving absence of restrains but also as self-mastery, involving the exercise of choice. It is true that Mill valued choice and individuality as ends in themselves and not because they promoted general happiness. Mill sought to protect individual liberty without any restrains but the denial of findividual autonomy with support of moral majority and public opinion. Mill favoured freedom of thought, speech and action. He believed in toleration of opinions and unhampered freedom of discussion He had confidence that truth would definitely survive in the struggle of ideas.

The bifurcation of human actions into two-self regarding and other regarding as made by Mill is quite impracticable. No individual is an island in himself. There is very little that one can do which does not affect other person. It is but natural and each action of individual will definitely affects the others. Therefore, it is difficult to set apart a sphere of conduct which should be regarded exclusively the affair of the individual concerned.

Check Your Progress -1

1. Who was James Staurt Mill and where was he born?
2. Give a brief introduction of J.S. Mill's political theory.
3. Mention some of the famous books of J.S. Mill.
4. When did Mill contest for a membership in the house of Lords?
5. What are the chief characteristics of a good society according to J.S. Mill?
6. When did J.S.Mill serve as Lord Rector of the University of St. Andrews?

7. What was the basic philosophy of Utilitarian Principles of J.S. Mill
8. Write in brief the concept of J.S. Mill's Individual Liberty.
9. What are the various types of liberties according to J.S. Mill?

2.5 Views on State and principles of Socialism:

Mill visualized the State as a moral institution concerned with the promotion of virtue and excellence in the individual citizen According to him, 'A welfare State safeguards liberty of its citizens but also undertakes regulation of free market economy in order 40 safeguard the interest of vulnerable sections like-workers and consumers.' He felt that a conception of good I: life was. More important than a life devoted to the pursuit of pleasure. He pleaded for the removal of obstacles in the way of the individual's self-development that made life less mean and less intolerable for the masses He viewed that State as a product of wills though not of interest and contended that to ignore the State as constituted by human wills was fallacious. Mill visualized that state not only protect the essential goods and services (like-food, clothing, shelter, health care, education etc) for mobilizing human resources but also protect the cultural heritage (like-monuments, museums, libraries, art galleries, botanical gardens, zoological parks et.) for promoting intellectual and cultural development of society.

Mill deviated from the classical liberalism i.e. laissez faire principles and he tried to accommodate socialism within liberalism He realized that unless Liberalism adapted itself, to changing times it would not be able to sustain itself. Mill brought about this change without giving up the fundamental of liberalism. On the other hand, he preferred State intervention in matters of social and economic policy. He advocates socialism within the overall framework of a market economy.

Mill' socialism' was mainly aimed at the full development of the individual's faculties and the liberation of the human potential He visualized society as composed of free, equal, independent and virtuous citizens who contributed their best towards the common good and would in turn receive fair rewards for their contributions. Mill was attracted to Socialism because of its idea of human cooperation but he was equally keen to preserve individually and freedom. He believed the need to change capitalism by bringing in the ethic of social welfare and cooperation He opposed potential tyranny of capitalist and supported socialist society with public opinion. He also supported local workers, retail cooperatives and schemes of sharing profits between workers and managers and other workers savings investment and insurance schemes. So, Mill advocacy of the participation of workers in management and protect the views on citizenship. He did not think that socialism would solve the problems that capitalism faced but opposed the injustice and misery placed by capitalism.

Mill's concept of socialism in not free from some defects; He described socialism as educative but was not hopeful of its success Mill's socialism prevented the proponents of laissez faire and the free market from becoming complacent Mill considered the problem of maintaining property rights within socialism and also against the submersion of individuality within socialism.

2.6 Democracy and Representative Government

Mill was a clear advocate of Demociacy. He wanted to maintain individual liberty in all thezes of human endeavour. In his book 'Considerations on Representative Government' published in 1861 analysed his views on democracy and understanding the subject of democracy in different context. Mill was the first liberal-democratic theorist who advocated maximum development of human capabilities like-moral, intellectual, aesthetic, as well as material productive capabilities. In his view,

liberal-democratic approach not only established boundaries for the pursuit of individual satisfaction, it was also instrumental in the free development of individuality. In a liberal democratic purview, it encouraged citizens' participation in political life through voting, involvement in local administration and sought to create their direct interest in government. Mill believed that liberty of though; discussion and action are necessary conditions for the development of independence of mind and autonomous judgment in Democracy. Mill conceived of democratic politics as prime mechanism of moral self-development.

According to Mill, the best form of government is the representative government. It is essential for the protection and enhancement of liberty as well as human reason. He viewed that without representative government, the rulers are tyranny and to make arbitrary laws. Representative Government is the most suitable device for the enactment of laws based on lomian reason and the principle of liberty. And also, representative government is always accountable to the citizen and creates citizen capable of pursuing the public interest. The nment should not be representative of a minority but of the entire community. Mill ated that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty cemid give legitimacy to the government. Mill believed that individuals have developed their full capacities in a representative government and also share in the process of governance. And, Democracy was good because it made people happier, and better. An ideal representative gwrernment must safeguard the aggregate interest of the society as a whole.

Mill's concept of Representative Government was also crtisiced with some basic questions. Mill emphasized that representative government was only possible in a state that was small and homogeneous an assertion that has been nullified by the success of plural democracies like India. And also, Mill sought to recommend a plural system of voting. According to him all adults should have a vote but the wiser and more talented should have more votes than the ignorant and less capable. On this point, Mill seems to depart from the common notion of democracy. He wants to make aware of the pitfalls of democracy. He believed that democracy based on the authority of numbers. So, he explained it on that principle' everyone to count fore and no one for more than one'. As a result it ignores the obvious differences of intelligence zxl virtue. This notion of democracy is detrimental to moral and intellectual excellence of zrkird. He viewed that democracy based on the authority of numbers is bound to be reduced mediocracy i.e. the rule of mediocre; it means the men of poor standard.

Mill believed to rectify the faults of democracy by constituting a 'representative. Vernment' based on proportional representation, plural voting, and second chamber. Mill also mmecommended open rather than secret ballot for voting. It was a public trust which should be performed under the eye and criticism of the public. This voting system would be less dangerous for the individual. Mill believed that citizens developed intellectual qualities of reason and gent only through political participation. He also believed that the compulsory elementary tion for that would make individual citizens wise and competent. So, he recommended iation system should be established and controlled by the state.

2.7 Rights of Women:

Mill was the first philosopher who considered equal tights for women. Mill main concern equality as a legal right between the sexes. Mill rightly regarded improvement in the petition of women as a concern not restricted to women alone but

of entire mankind his brilliant essay on 'The Subjection of Women' was published in 1869. In this essay, he has strongly maintained that there is no known difference between men and women that would jsffly attributing different rights to them in his book he made a strong claim for equal status inects of right to vote, right to equal opportunities in education and right to employment. Being highly appreciated work and most precious for feminist perspective. In this regard, Harriet Taylor, William Thompson, Pierre Leroux and so on acknowledged the writings of Mill regard to women's question.

Mill argued that the biological differences between men and women cannot be logically iuvoed to justify exclusion of women from the suffrage from the professions and from all the avnues of progress which have so far remained open to men. Mill pointed out that csition to sexual equality was not based on reason. Mill's defend of equality between the probably represents the most effective vindication of the feminist cause he was convinced that women could not be treated as inferior to men in terms of their intellectual and spiritual capabilities. Mill argued that the subjection of women and men was not wrong itself but also in the way to human progress. According to him society is always respect each and everybody without any discrimination and endeavours to realize the full potential for their progress. So, we must stop the subjection of women and promote Social progress with full equality between men and women. We should not allow suppress the power and privileges one sections of the society.

In his book 'The Subjection of Women' Mill noted that men and women are naturally Iified and equal capabilities for all the activities. He has emphatically demonstrated that there . Ow no inherent differences in the mental faculties of men and women and also women are as capable of holding responsible positions as men themselves. Mill pointed out that the rule of men an w women was based on force. Women also accepted it voluntarily without complaint and obey their subordination. Women from childhood were thought to be submissive, yielding and 1 cmmodating rather than become independent with self-will and self control. They were it to live for others their husbands and children. Mill argued that the modem world accepted general social practice of human equality but not gender equality. Mill articulated and A & nded the right of women to be considered as free rational beings capable of choosing the life dWy would like to lead for themselves He recommended opening of all repectable professions lb the women in order to restore their dignity and to enable them to utilize their talents to speed vp social progress.

Mill reiterated the conventional assumptions about the women role in a patriarchal nily. In rearing children, doing household activities, women contributed more to the household Nl also spent their common life for the betterment of the family. So, a family should nurture eIings of sympathy in equality and love rather than subordination and command to women. In this regard, Mill viewed that the relationship between men and women should be based on utual respect and mutual love giving due regard to one another's rights This would make them and self-sufficient. Mill emphasized a good education for the women so that they itid brighten their dull and impoverished lives and also enhanced equal opportunities in all sphere of life Mill desired that the subjection of women be ended not merely by law alone but education, opinion, habits and finally a change in family life itself.

Mill believed that the withdrawal of subjection of women like slavery in the name of custom. And it was necessary to remove the legal barriers which restricted women's opportumties He firmly believed for equality of women for the benefit and

uplift of the State Mill's impact of Feminism obviously appeared in the early 20th century when the Feminist Movement fought for women freedom for participating in the functions of the State.

Check Your Progress – 2

1. What is the main role of State according to J.S. Mill?
2. What is Socialism according to J.S. Mill?
3. Name of the book through which J.S. Mill favoured the Representative Government?
4. What was the basic condition for Representative Government according to J.S. Mill?
5. What did J.S. Mill intend to convey through his work Considerations on Representative Government?
6. What was Mill's opinion on women's question'?

2.8 Let us Sum up

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) was the most influential political thinker of the nineteenth century. He was regarded as progressive philosopher because he reformed some philosophical ideas. Mill was a rationalist and the utilitarian and also the philosopher of human liberation, individuality and equality.

Mill criticized the Bentham Utilitarian Principles 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' and Mill was convinced that a good society was One which consisted of happy peoples and happiness came out of self-reliance, tolerance, wide-renging interests and a compassionate temper.

Mill's most important concern was the preservation of liberty within a democratic society as intrinsic good in itself and looked down on majority tyranny and mass mediocrity as potent to individuality and liberty. He regarded liberty as necessary means for the development duality which will become the ultimate source of happiness.

Mill was also convinced that advancement of democracy would depend on the spread of education and schooling. People had to be free to participate in the government of their country. Mill was an advocate for liberal democracy where the powers of legally elected majorities limited by the protection of individual rights against majorities.

Mill welcomed the idea of socialism winning over private property but it would have to a socialism that respected individuality. He wanted the most people to enjoy property and for he insisted on restricting the rights of inheritance, limiting the size of the population and g the quality and quantity of education.

Mill was the first male philosopher of considerable stature and repute to consider the women's Question'. Mill was the first to raise women's question and identity and alone with his active support for women's causes, played a pivotal role in advancing the women's movement.

2.9 Key Words

Utility:

It defines the amount of satisfaction derived from the consumption of goods or marking use of services.

Utilitarianism:

It defines pleasure and freedom from pain is the only things desirable as ends; and all desirable things are desirable either for the pleasure inherent in themselves or as a means to the promotion of pleasure and prevention of pain.

Individual Liberty:

It defines liberation from restrains particularly from the restraints imposed by a tradition-bound society like a feudal state or by an authoritarian regime.

Laissez Faire:

A French term which means 'leave alone'. It implied the policy of non intervention by the State in economic activities of individuals.

Representative Government:

It defines a form of government which is elected by the people; in such a form of government, only those who are the elected representative have the power to make laws and institute taxes.

Proportional Representation:

It defines an electoral system where multi-member constituencies are provided for electing representative to a council, assembly or parliament.

Subjugation:

It defines the State of gaining control over somebody or something.

2.10 Suggested Readings

Gauba P.O., Western Political Thought, Macmillan Publishing India Ltd., 2011, pp-205-217.

Mukherjee Subrata, Ramaswamy Sushila, A History of Political Thought – Plato to Marx, PHI Learning Private Limited, Delhi, 2015, pp-406-436.

Nelson R. Brian, Western Political Thoughts – From Socrates to the Age of Ideology, Pearson, 2007, pp-306-311.

Sabine H. George, Thorson L. Thomas, A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing, 1973, pp-638-650.

2.11 Possible Answers to Check your Progress 1 & 2

Check your Progress – 1

1. J.S. Mill was British Philosopher, economist and statesman who made significant contribution in the fields of logic, ethics, politics and metaphysics. He was a great political thinker of moderm time who contributed to socio-economic and political theory. He was born in London on May 1806.
2. J.S. Mill was the most influential political thinker of the nineteenth century. In his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissez faire to an active role for the State from a negative to positive conception of liberty.
3. Some of the famous books of J.S. Mill are – System of logic (1843), Principles of Political Economy (1848), Essay on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy, On Liberty (1959), Considerations on Representative Government (1861), Utilitarianism (1865), The Subjection of Women (1869).
4. He contested for a membership in the House of Lords in the year 1865.
5. Mill was convinced that a good society was one which consisted of happy peoples and happiness came out of self-reliance, rationality, tolerance and

comprehensive temper. Self development and moral progress were instrumental to such a good life, leading to the establishment of the life of the individual as a work of art.

6. He served as Lord Rector of the University of St. Andrews during the period 1865-68.
7. Mill criticized and modified Bentham's Utilitarianism. He asserted that the chief deficiency of Bentham's ethics was the neglect of individual character and hence stressed on the cultivation on feeling as part of good life. He made it clear that poetry, drama, music, painting was essential ingredients both for human happiness and human development in formation of character.
8. Mill defined that individuality meant the power or capacity for critical enquiry and responsible thought. It meant self-development and the expression of free will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress.
9. On liberty, Mill identified various types of liberties-liberty of conscience, liberty of thought and feeling, absolute freedom of opinion, liberty of expressing and publishing opinions, freedom to Unite for any purpose, liberty of making the plan of our life to suit our own character.

Check your Progress -2

1. State safeguards liberty of its citizens but also undertakes regulation of free mark economy in order to safeguards the interests of vulnerable sections like-workers ai consumers. State is concerned with all aspects of welfare of its citizens.
2. Mill's 'socialism' was essentially libertarian for it aimed at the full development of ti individual's faculties and the liberation of the humah potential. Mill was attracted so cialism because of its idea of human cooperation but he was equally keen to preseri individuality and freedom,
3. The name of the book is 'Considerations on Representative Government' published 1861.
4. Mill laid down some basic condition for representative government. A government could only function with citizens who were of an active, self-helping character where citizet would be able to run a representative democracy. And citizens had to show their abilil and willingness to preserve institutions of representative democracy.
5. Mill in his book 'Considerations on Representative Government' called for variot reforms of the Parliament and voting specially proportional representation, the sing. Transferable vote and the extension of suffrage.
6. Mill raised the issues of continuing relevance to women, namely the alleged difference between men and women, sexual division of labour, the family as an instrument change, freedom of choice for women and the reasons for women's subordination ar, oppression.

2.12 References:

Bhandari D.R. History of European Political Philosophy, the Bangalore Printing & Publishing Company.

Smith G.W., John Stuart Mill's Social and Political Thought, Critical Assessment, London, Routledge.

Sabire, Gil. 4 History of Political Theory : New Delhi: Oxford, IBH.

Zakaras Alex and Urbinati Nadia, J.S. Mill's Political Thought : A Bicentennial Reassessment, New Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

2.13 Model Questions:

1. Critically analyse the Utilitarian principles of J.S. Mill.
2. Why has Bentham been regarded as 'Progressing philosopher' by J.S. Mill?
3. Critically examine Mill's concept of Individual Liberty.
4. Critically review that Democracy can survive through 'representative government', do you agree with this view, give reasons for your answer.
5. Evaluate J.S. Mill's argument against the subjection of women.
6. Describe J.S. Mill's contribution to the history of Political Science
7. Write a short easy on J.S. Mill political philosophy.
8. Describe Mill's distinction between the public sphere of law and the private sphere of flkIity.

Dr. Mridul Dutta

Assistant Professor, Bahona College, Dept. of Political Science

UNIT - III

T.H .Green

Structure

3.0: Objectives

After reading this unit you will be able to

- Understand the Political Philosophy of T.H. Green
- Discuss Green's Theory of State
- Explain Green's view on State activity
- Discuss Green's Theory of freedom and Rights
- Understand Green's views on punishment
- Analyze Green on Private Property
- Evaluate Green's views on Internationalism

3.1: Introduction

In the previous unit you have learned about the political thoughts of J.S. Mill. In this unit you will learn about the thoughts and ideas of British idealist Thomas Hill Green. He was an English philosopher, reformer and member of British idealist movement. The writings of Green show an amalgamation of ethics, metaphysics and politics. He gives a remarkable turn to the prevailing trend of liberalism. He adopts an ethical point of view and criticizes the new social system. He therefore suggests that the government should maintain conditions of life where morality is possible. He tries to reintegrate the individual with the socially created values. This unit discuss the various theories espouses by T.H. Green.

3.2: A Brief life sketch of T.H. Green

Thomas Hill Green was born at Birkin in the West Riding of Yorkshire in 1836. His father was an Anglican parson and a well known personality. During young ages he was educated at home and later at the age of nineteen he was sent to Balliol College, Oxford. He was elected a Fellow of the Balliol College and later was appointed as the Whyte Professor of Moral Philosophy. At Oxford he taught ethics, history of philosophy, metaphysics, logic and several subjects. Green was interested in public affairs. He joined the Liberal Party and participated in campaigns. He was a member of the Oxford Town council and School Board. He died in March 1882 at the age of forty six. His major works include Prolegomena to Ethics, Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract and Lectures on the Principles of Political obligation.

3.3: Green's Theory of State

Greens theory of State was influenced by various sources – Greek, French, German and English. He comes to the conclusion that the basis of political authority lies in human consciousness. According to Green, consciousness is a distinctive characteristic of human beings and it makes human being different from others.

Green rejected the Force Theory of origin of state. because it made force the basis of state. But, according to Green, 'the basis of state is will and not force'. According to Green, the real determinant of habitual obedience is the moral conviction of the people. The sovereignty expresses the general will of the people and the consciousness informs the people that the laws of the state are meant for their own good. For, green the state is the result of the desires of man for a common good. He enjoins upon the state to develop and cultivate this rudimentary conception and convert an individual into an intelligent patriot by giving him share in the management of public affairs. His theory of state is thus a fusion of idealism and realism.

According to Green, State is a means to an end. The end was the full moral development of the individual who composes it. Green believes that the good government may not be popular government. Therefore, he insisted that the best government is self government. He insisted on the establishment of an active participation in a democratic state.

Need of political authority: Green is of the view that man actuated by his selfless or real will should move on the right path and he does so. But, sometimes his actual will or selfishness might operate and compel him to do something not worth of doing. Here the state enters the system and uses force against selfish persons to preserve the freedom. The sovereign should maintain the system of rights and create favorable condition for sustenance of moral consciousness of the community.

Resistance to the authority of the state is not justified except under special circumstances. So long as the state remains true to its conception and represents the general will, resistance cannot be justified. But, sometimes government makes laws in the interest of a particular section. Or sometimes fail to recognize the rights essential for development of moral capabilities of the individuals. Under such circumstances disobedience of law and resistance may be justified. But, such disobedience is permitted only if it is resorted for the sake of the good of the society.

To sum up, Green was of the view that the state is a moral being animated by moral purpose. Masses obey the state because it represents the general will. Therefore, in order to be permanent the state must work according to the consent of the governed.

3.4: Green's view on State activity:

According to Green, the action of state is to be confined to the removal of obstacles or to the maintenance of the conditions of life in which morality shall be possible, where morality consist in the disinterested performance of self-imposed duties.

The characteristic of state activity have birth negative and positive aspects. In the negative aspect the state should hinder the hindrances to good life. Morality cannot be formed upon from outside. An act can be truly moral only when it is freely self determined. According to Green, a penalty for disobedience does interfere with the spontaneous action of those interests and consequently checks the growth of the capacity, that is the state should only the to remove the obstacles.

He lays emphasis on the removal of i. ignorance ii. Pauperism iii. Drinking Alcohol. So, that morality becomes possible. Therefore, Green emphasized Compulsory education, employment opportunities and prohibition. He therefore took part in social campaign and opened a coffee shop in Oxford to distract attention of drunkards.

The philosophical justification of the idea of **welfare state** can be found in the writings of T.H. Green. Green suggests concrete steps and tries to work out a theory of state activity consistent with his age. He lays stress on economic and social democracy along with political democracy along with political democracy. Here we get a glimpse of welfare state which was later developed.

3.5: Green's Theory of freedom and Rights:

<u>Theory of Freedom and Rights:</u>

Green on Freedom:

According to Green freedom is a great blessing. It is necessary for self – realization of citizens. He was of the view that human consciousness postulates freedom as the necessary condition of its very growth and expression. He takes a

positive view of freedom and describes it as the power or capacity of doing or enjoying something in common with others. By freedom, Green meant an environment in which one was permitted to make his own choice. Without state, freedom was not possible. Liberty is the positive power of doing something, something which is worth of doing something.

Green on Rights:

Rights: the self consciousness of man wills the goodness of its relation with others. Therefore, when each recognizes self goodness and goodness of others evolve. When a claim is recognized by others it becomes a right. The rights are thus conditions for attainment of moral ends and the source is found in the moral consciousness of man.

It is a very important aspect of his political philosophy. The important characteristics are-

a. rights are created by the moral consciousness of the community and enforced by the state. when the claim of an individual arisen out of self-consciousness, it is translated into a right.
b. the rights are natural as they are necessary means to an end which every moral being pursue.
c. natural rights are different from legal rights as the natural rights are more closer to morality than law. They are created by moral consciousness of the community.
d. state doesnot create rights, it simply enforces and protects them. The rights actually arise out of the eternal self-consciousness of the individual.

According to Green, sometimes resistance arises out of the discrepancy between the natural rights of the imperfect stats. Then a healthy public opinion must be created and thus when the whole community becomes convinced with the need of civil disobedience for the sake of public good, the resistance will be justified. Green therefore has been admired for recognizing the right to resistance.

Check your progress - 1

1. Name some of Green's major works.
2. How do we find the philosophical foundation of welfare state in the writings of Green?
3. How Green justifies the need of political authority?

3.6: Green on punishment

According to Green, punishment should never be exclusively preventive, retributive or reformatory. It should incorporate the essential elements of all the three. Punishment should be preventive for the maintenance of the system of rights and obligations. Punishment should be retributive as it is inflicted upon the guilty to make him realize his wrong doing. Punishment should be reformatory as it recovers person from his criminal habits.

Punishment has both negative and positive effects. In negative aspect punishment is a force preventive of a force opposed to freedom. In the positive aspect punishment is for correction of criminals.

According to Green, the purpose of punishment is moral. The purpose is to maintain conditions and remove obstacles from the way of moral life of the people in order to secure freedom of creation of will of every member of the community.

3.7: Green on Private Property:

Green is a strong defender of the institution of private property. He considers property to be a sum of instruments necessary and useful for promoting the best life of the individual. Without property no individual would be able to give effect to his free will and contribute to the best life of community. The idea of property may be summed up as:

- Property is a condition necessary for free pay of a capacity
- Property cannot be equalized
- State should control private property in land

The idea of Private property as put forwarded by Green is criticized as Green has idealized the institution of property as it in defense of capitalism.

3.8: Green on Internationalism:

Green denounces the idea of world War and emphasis the need for a world organization. He argues that War violates man's right to life. War is a moral wrong and thus it should be avoided. But, if there is no other way and war becomes a necessary, then he calls it a 'cruel necessity'. The state cannot infringe the right of man as man by conflict with other state. The state cannot infringe the right of man as man by conflict with other state. War may be relative right in unavoidable circumstances; but it cannot be an absolute right. Green in this idea of internationalism lays emphasis on world peace and international intercourse. For Green, if the states move towards perfection then the prospect of war will come down.

Check your progress - 2

1. What according to Green is the purpose of punishment?
2. How Green defended private property?
3. What Green meant by 'cruel necessity'?

3.9: Let Us sum up

- Thomas Hill Green was an English philosopher, reformer and member of British idealist movement. He gives a remarkable turn to the prevailing trend of liberalism. His writings show an amalgamation of ethics, metaphysics and politics.
- T. H. Green's major works include Prolegomena to Ethics, Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract and Lectures on the Principles of Political obligation.
- T.H. Green comes to the conclusion that the basis of political authority lies in human consciousness. According to Green, consciousness is a distinctive characteristic of human beings and it makes human being different from others.
- According to Green, the action of state is to be confined to the removal of obstacles or to the maintenance of the conditions of life in which morality shall be possible, where morality consist in the disinterested performance of self-imposed duties. The philosophical justification of the idea of welfare state can be found in the writings of T.H. Green.
- T.H. Green was of the view that human consciousness postulates freedom as the necessary condition of its very growth and expression. He takes a positive view of freedom and describes it as the power or capacity of doing or enjoying something in common with others. The sovereign should

maintain the system of rights and create favorable condition for sustenance of moral consciousness of the community.

- According to Green, freedom is a great blessing. It is necessary for self – realization of citizens. Human consciousness postulates liberty, liberty involves rights and right demand state. By freedom, Green meant an environment in which one was permitted to make his own choice.
- Green was of the view that punishment should never be exclusively preventive, retributive or reformatory. It should incorporate the essential elements of all the three. The purpose of punishment is to maintain conditions and remove obstacles from the way of moral life of the people in order to secure freedom of creation of will of every member of the community.
- T. H. Green is a strong defender of the institution of private property. He considers property to be a sum of instruments necessary and useful for promoting the best life of the individual. Without property no individual would be able to give effect to his free will and contribute to the best life of community.
- Green denounces the idea of world War and emphasis the need for a world organization. He argues that War violates man's right to life. War is a moral wrong and thus it should be avoided. But, if there is no other way and war becomes a necessary, then he calls it a 'cruel necessity'.

3.10 Keywords:

Liberalism: it is a political philosophy founded on ideas of liberty and equality. They support the ideas of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, civil rights, international cooperation etc. it became a distinct political movement during the Age of Enlightment. It rejected the prevailing social and political norms.

Idealism: idealism is a group of metaphysical philosophies which asserts that reality is fundamentally mental, mentally constructed, or otherwise immaterial. Idealism believes consciousness and mind to be origin of the material world and aims to explain world according to these principles. Features of idealism includes- state is an ethical institution, state is the protector of rights of individuals, state should remove obstacles to good life.

Pauperism: Pauperism is a term which means poverty or the state of being poor, in English usage it refers to the condition of being a 'pauper' i.e. in receipt of relief administered under the English Poor Laws.

3.11: Suggested readings

- Sabine George H & Thomas L Thorson *A History of Political Theory,* New Delhi, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd
- Das P.G. *History of Political Thought,* Kolkata: New Central Book Agency
- Hoffman John, *A Glossary of Political Theory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Mishra K.K. and Kalpana M. Iyengar, *Modern Political Theory*: New Delhi: S. Chand & Company
- Johari J.C., *Political Thought (Modern, Recent and Contemporary)*, New Delhi: Metropolitan Book Co. Private Ltd.

- Sharma S.K. and Urmila Shrama, *Western Political Thought (From Bentham to Present day)*, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Probable Answers to 'Check your Progress'

Answer to check your progress- 1

1. Some major works of Green were Prolegomena to Ethics, Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract and Lectures on the Principles of Political obligation.
2. The philosophical justification of the idea of welfare state can be found in the writings of T.H. Green. Green suggests concrete steps and tries to work out a theory of state activity consistent with his age. He lays stress on economic and social democracy along with political democracy along with political democracy. Here we get a glimpse of welfare state which was later developed.
3. Green was of the view that man actuated by his selfless or real will should move on the right path and he does so. But, sometimes his actual will or selfishness might operate and compel him to do something not worth of doing. Here the state enters the system and uses force against selfish persons to preserve the freedom. Thus, there is the need of political authority.

Answer to check your progress 2

1. According to Green, the purpose of punishment is moral. The purpose is to maintain conditions and remove obstacles from the way of moral life of the people in order to secure freedom of creation of will of every member of the community.
2. Green is a strong defender of the institution of private property. He considers property to be a sum of instruments necessary and useful for promoting the best life of the individual. Without property no individual would be able to give effect to his free will and contribute to the best life of community.
3. According to Green, war is a moral wrong and thus it should be avoided. But, if there is no other way and war becomes a necessary, then he calls it a 'cruel necessity'.

Model Questions

1. Give a brief life sketch of T.H. Green.
2. "Will, not force, is the basis of the state" – Green. Explain.
3. "Human consciousness postulates liberty; liberty involves rights; rights demand the state"-Green. Elucidate and examine.
4. Discuss Green's theory of political obligation.
5. Discuss Green's Theory of Private Property.
6. Explain Green's view on State activity.

BLOCK -5

UNIT - I

KARL MARX

1.0 Objectives

After going through this unit you would be able to acquaint yourself with-

- The life and works of Karl Marx.
- Marx's idea on Dialectical Materialism
- Marx's view on Historical Materialism
- Marx's understanding on the concept of alienation
- Marx's view on the concept of surplus value
- Marx's idea of the Class struggle
- Marx's idea of capitalism
- Marx's theory of State
- Marx on revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat

1.1 Introduction

In the previous blocks, you have been introduced to the contributions of contractualist thinkers as well as the theories and ideas of western liberal thinkers. This block will be about the contributions of Marxist thinkers. In this unit you will be introduced to the works of Karl Marx, whose work impacted significantly in understanding society from a different perspective, popularly known today as Marxism.

Peter Worsley (2002) very aptly noted that "Karl Marx has probably affected the course of twentieth century history more than any other single thinker".[i] Worsley is very right in saying this because if you look back at history, you would be able to understand how Marx's writings exerted significant amount of impact in social engagements and political discourses. It need mention here that, the thoughts and ideas forwarded by Marx had little impact in his own lifetime but after his death, millions of people regarded them as effective in making the world a better place.

Marx was born on March 5, 1818 in the predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland, Germany in a Jewish Family. Marx's family converted into Lutheranism. Marx studied law in the University of Bonn in 1835 and the University of Berlin in 1836. Marx was a prolific writer and philosopher. The heart and soul of Marx's lifework was a massive critical analysis of the political economy of bourgeois economy (Robert Paul Wolff: 1988).[ii] His important writings include: Capital (Vol. 1), 1867; Capital (Vol. 2), 1885; Capital (Vol. 3), 1894; The Communist Manifesto (with Engels), 1848; The German Ideology, 1845; Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Rights, 1844; The Class Struggles in France, 1850; Revolution and Counter Revolution (with Engels), 1896; Critique of Political Economy, 1859 etc. He died in 1883 at the age of 65.

The ideologies that Marx forwarded are regarded today as Marxism and his followers as Marxists. R. N Berki (1988) commented that Marxism can be viewed "as a doctrine of human liberation where 'liberation' or 'freedom is understood in the distinctive western sense of rational mastery of the self and external reality."[iii] In this unit, you will be introduced to some important theories and ideas of Marx. After reading this, you would certainly be in a position to appreciate Marxism and would be able see its application in a grossly fragmented contemporary society.

1.2 Marx on Materialism: Dialectical and Historical

The theory of materialism is very central to understand Marxism. Marx's materialist theory forms the basis for his explanations of how individuals interact within society and how societies develop and provides the ground for his critique of

capitalism and his advocacy for communism. A detailed analysis of Marx's Dialectical and Historical Materialism is made in the following.

1.2.1 Dialectal Materialism

Karl Marx was deeply influenced by the works of Hegel (1770-1831), another German intellectual precursor to him. Marx rejected many of the thesis forwarded by Hegel and refined some of them, among which dialectical materialism is a significant one. Dialectical Materialism considers the universe, not as static, not as unchanging, but in continual process of development. It considers this development, not as smooth, continuous and unbroken process, but as a process in which phases of gradual evolutionary change are interrupted by breaks in continuity, by the sudden leap from one state to another (Maurice Cornforth: 1971, P. 46).[iv]

The word dialectics in plain terms as highlighted by Maurice Cornforth (1971) refers to a method of intellectual discussion by dialogue embedded in logic. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), another German philosopher used this concept to a great deal in understanding the reality contrasting it with reason and logic. Marx used this concept to understand the contradiction between the opposite tendencies found in the society. Dialectics means contradictions in the very essence of things. Everybody is seen in the contradictions of its opposite and these contradictions form the very basis of social change. Social change is possible in the society because of the existence of opposite tendencies in the society. Something new has to come. These dialectics can help to understand the very nature of directions of social change. Dialectics is the method used by Marx to advance his arguments by which change in the society can be expected. This is called Marx's methodology. Method is the technical procedure with the help of which conclusions are arrived at. His basic intentions were to bring about a change in the basic order of society.

Dialectical materialism suggests that the world is material by its very name. Everything is caused, oriented, moved and developed by matter. Matter decides and determines everything in the society. Ideas run the world but matter runs the one that have a subjective existence. Marx says "My ideas of dialectics are not only different from Hegel but also are its direct opposite." Hence Marx believes that the idealists are superficial about their position. In fact, Marx's idea is nothing but the material world reflected by human mind and translated into human thought. Marx believes that which is ideal is also material. Marx's friend Friedrich Engels put forward the three major laws of dialectical materialism: (a) Law of unity and struggle of opposites, (b) Law of transformation from quantity to quality and (c) Law of Negation of Negation.

The Law of unity and struggle of opposites talks about the very nature or cause of social change. The law of transformation from quantity to quality talks about the very manner of social change. The law of negation of negation talks about the very direction of social change. Change refers to any break in continuity that which existed is no longer found in existence. That which did not exist is found in existence. If a change occurs then existing situation becomes altered. If there is a thesis then there is Anti-thesis, then change must occur which is called synthesis i.e. Thesis- Anti-thesis-Synthesis. Thesis suggests the very system, forms the very basis of social change. There is contradiction between thesis and anti-thesis. Thesis means the position, Anti-thesis means the opposition and Synthesis means the combination. Thesis is the being, Anti-thesis is no being and the synthesis is the change. (R. Priya: 2017).[v]

1.2.2 Historical Materialism

Although the inauguration of a new theory of history was Marx's major theoretical achievements, relatively few of his writings directly address this topic. The one explicit and general discussion of historical materialism in Marx's own works occurs in a brief but celebrated passage in the Preface to 'The Critique of Political Economy (1859). Historical Materialism, was not a principal focus of Marx's theoretical investigations, however it is implicit in many of his investigations and is a fundamental component of Marxism. Marx argued that the overall course of human history can be divided into a series of distinct epochs, each characterised by a distinctive set of relations of ownership and control of productive resources. These relations of production explain critical properties of the society's political and ideological institutions, its 'superstructure' and are themselves explained by the level of development of the society's technology and overall organization of the production process, its 'forces of production' (Erik Olin Wright, Andrew Levine and Elliot Sober: 1992).[vi] G. A. Cohen's seminal work on "Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence" published in 1978 was the first to uncover and develop the casual structures of Marx's theory.

Marx's theory of historical materialism advances two general claims:

(a) that the level of development of productive forces in a society explains the set of social relations of production, the "economic Structure" of the society; and

(b) that the economic structure of a society, its "economic base" explains that society's legal and political "superstructures" and forms of consciousness.

Cohen lucidly designates the above claims of Marx as (i) the Primary Thesis and (ii) Base/ Superstructure Thesis (Erik Olin Wright, Andrew Levine and Elliot Sober: 1992, P.16). While understanding the theory of historical materialism the understanding of 'base-superstructure relationship' holds paramount importance. Base and superstructure are two linked theoretical concepts found in the works of Karl Marx. Simply put, base refers to the forces and relations of production—to all the people, relationships between them, the roles that they play, and the materials and resources involved in producing the things needed by society. Superstructure on the other hand, refers to all other aspects of society which includes culture, ideology, norms, identities, social institutions viz. education, religion, family, the political structure, and the state. Marx opined that the superstructure grows out of the base, and reflects the interests of the ruling class that controls it. As such, the superstructure justifies how the base operates, and in doing so, justifies the power of the ruling class. It is important to recognize that neither the base nor the superstructure is naturally occurring and nor are they static. They are both social creations (created by people in a society), and both are the accumulation of social processes and interactions between people that are constantly playing out, shifting, and evolving (Nicki L. Cole: 2017).[vii]

Karl Marx's theory of history sees human society as being fundamentally determined at any given time by its material conditions, or the relationships which people have with each other for producing and reproducing the means of human existence. Marx identified six successive stages of the development of these material conditions in Western Europe. These are: Primitive Communism, Slave Society, Feudalism, Capitalism, Socialism, and Communism.

First, for Marx, comes the stage of primitive communism, in which the mode of production is simply "a further extension of the natural division of labour existing in the family, with resources plentiful enough for the concept of individual

‘ownership’ of property not to exist.” In the next stage i.e. the slave society, according to Marx slave exist but they are outside the family and hence, in a sense, exist outside of society. By the feudal stage of ownership the class-strata has expanded into a vast social hierarchy creating two distinct classes-feudal lords and the serfs. In order for the bourgeoisie to fully exploit capital, the serfs must be freed from their hierarchical obligations; and thus, argues Marx, 'begins an epoch of social revolution’. With the end of feudalism comes Capitalism, which for Marx signifies the epitome of the inequality of class based society. With the proletariat uniting against the capitalists resorting to revolution, a brief stage called socialism would come. This stage is utopian in nature because while analysing the stages of history Marx also visualised a futuristic society. After Socialism, Marx believes, that Communism would become an inevitable phenomenon, where equality would be ensured and the state would wither away. Marx thoroughly analyzed capitalism as it was the stage he lived in and predicted that it would eventually be replaced by first Socialism and then Communism. Marx’s theory of history is centred on the idea that forms of society rise and fall as they proceed, and then impede the development of human productive power.

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 01**

Question 01: Dialectical materialism suggests that the world is ______by its very name.

(a) abstract
(b) material
(c) ideational
(d) physical

Question 02: Marx believed that Communism would bring __________.

(a) chaos
(b) world peace
(c) equality
(d) inequality

Question 03: Write a note on Marx’s materialist interpretation of the stages of history

1.3 Marx on Alienation, Concept of Surplus Value and Class Struggle

1.3.1 Marx on Alienation

‘Alienation’ is one of the greatest problems, which confronts societies even today. It explains the situation of man in the society. Karl Marx’s idea of alienation (*Entfremdung*) has a significant place in his own interpretation of Dialectical and Historical Materialism. Significant portions of his ideas on alienation can be found in ‘Economic and Philosophic Manuscript’, written in 1844.

According to Bhuvan Chandel (1979), "Marx defined alienation as a fact of political economy- a phenomenon of economic life. For him labour and capital were not only economic categories but also anthropological postulates imputed with value judgements. There are two aspects of labour; first is the alienated labour which gives rise to private property and second is the free creative labour which is the true expression of human life and essence. The first kind of labour Marx seeks to abolish and second he wants to realize. The passage from one to another is the passage from “is” to “ought”. In its second context, Labour is the self expression of man's individuality and his mental qualities. It is in its essence a self-activity not a commodity.[viii]

The fundamental idea is that an entity or agent gives rise to a product or expression that is distinct from but at the same time essential to itself. This secondary

product comes to be cut off from its origin. In consequence, the agent suffers a loss of identity in some sense. Thus, for the agent to realize itself fully, it must remove the separation that has come between itself and its own product. In the central discussion of the Paris Manuscripts, Marx sets out to apply the concept of alienation to the labour process. Alienation, Marx argues, is characteristic of a situation in which (1) labour is directed towards the production of commodities (that is, goods exchangeable in the market) and (2) labour itself is such a commodity. Marx says that 'alienation' is worse under capitalism than any economically less advanced society. Marx divides the alienation involved in labour into three main forms:

1. There is, first, the separation of the worker from the product of labour. It is in the nature of the labour process that it involves 'appropriating' the external world. But, when labour is alienated, the sensible, external world becomes an object to which the worker is bound, something that is hostile to him, instead of being the means to his self-realization.
2. At the same time, the labour process itself becomes alien to the worker. Because the imperatives according to which labour takes place come to the worker 'from outside' (that is, from the market, either directly or indirectly) labour is no longer an act of self-realization. It becomes, from the worker's point of view, 'an activity directed against himself, which is independent of him and does not belong to him' (Michael Rosen: 1998).[ix]

Marx noted that man is not a machine. The creativity in the man's work gives him/her satisfaction. This is the only way by which worker can express himself/herself through his/her products. Workers get lots of pleasure when the creativity of the work is appreciated by others. But in the large industrial units men are treated like machines and with the introduction of division of labour, the workers get alienated from his/ her product because he/she is forced to work only for earning his/her livelihood. Thus, the Division of labour in Marx's opinion leads to alienation of the labour from the worker's own products. Marx further noted that Labour is the source of all wealth, but when the worker does not get his/her due share, alienation results.

1.3.2 Marx's Theory of Surplus Value

Marx himself considered his theory of surplus value his most important contribution to the progress of economic analysis (Marx, letter to Engels of 24 August 1867). It is through this theory that the wide scope of his sociological and historical thought enables him simultaneously to place the capitalist mode of production in his historical context, and to find the root of its inner economic contradictions and its laws of motion in the specific relations of production on which it is based (Ernest Mandel: 1990)[x]. Marx wrote about the theory of surplus value in his famous work 'Capital'. The doctrine, embedded in the labour theory of value holds that labour spent by the labourer in the production of the commodity is the sole criterion for determining its value. While acknowledging that human labour cannot create value by itself alone, Marx noted that that it uses instruments of production which are owned by the capitalists. The capitalists buy the labour power of the labourer and then applies it to produce commodities which have an exchange value of the commodity and the wages paid to the worker by the capitalist in producing that commodity is surplus value. Marx thus, explains the whole process of exploitation of the working class by the capitalists with his theory of surplus value. To him, this sort of exploitation is a distinct feature of capitalist mode of production. Surplus value results because the commodity produced by the worker is sold by the capitalist for more than what the

worker receives as wages. Marx contended that the worker produces a commodity which belongs to the capitalist and whose value is realized by the capitalist in the form of price. This capital has two parts- (a) constant capital and (b) variable capital. Constant capital relates to means of production like raw material, machinery toolset used for commodity production. The variable capital denotes to the wages paid to the worker. Surplus value is the differences between the value produced by the worker and what he actually gets in exchange for this value of his labour. In other words, surplus value is unpaid labours of the labour.

Surplus value is a specific expression of the capitalist form of exploitation, in which the surplus product takes the form of surplus value. The production and appropriation of surplus value constitute the essence of the fundamental economic law of capitalism. Marx pointed out that "production of surplus value is the absolute law" of the capitalist mode of production. This law reflects not only the economic relations between capitalists and wage workers but also the economic relations between various groups of the bourgeoisie- industrialists, merchants, and bankers- and between them and the landowners. The pursuit of surplus value plays the chief role in the development of the productive forces under capitalism and determines and channels the development of production relations in capitalist society.

The doctrine of surplus value enabled Marx to formulate the fundamental economic law of motion of capitalist society and to reveal the objective tendencies of the development of capitalist society. Moreover, the theory of surplus value provided the key to understanding the capitalist mode of production. Thus, the theory of surplus value leads directly to the conclusion that the class contradictions between capital and wage labour are irreconcilable (V. Vygodsky: 2014).[xi] In plain words, workers create more value at work than they receive in wages. The extra value i.e. the 'surplus value' is exploited by the capitalist class which is to Marx is nothing but exploitation. Capitalism thus furthers inequality and exploitation.

1.3.3 Marx on class struggle

The Communist Manifesto published in 1848 started with this most quoted phrase- "the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles". From this statement, one can easily derive how Marx and his colleague Engels depicted the historical development of mankind. To them, the history of all existing societies is the history of struggles between two classes viz. the haves and the have-nots. **Class,** for Marx, is rooted in social relations of production, and cannot be referred in the first place to relations of distribution and consumption or their ideological reflections (Cliff Slaughter: 1975).[xii] Marx's analysis centres on how the relationships between men are shaped by their relative positions in regard to the means of production, that is, by their differential access to scarce resources and scarce power. He noted that unequal access need not at all times and under all conditions lead to active class struggle. But he considered that the potential for class conflict is inherent in every differentiated society, since such a society systematically generates conflicts of interest between persons and groups (Lewis A. Coser: 1977).[xiii]

Class struggle pushed society from one stage to the next, in a dialectical process. In each stage, an ownership class controls the means of production while a lower class provides labour for production. The two classes come into conflict and that conflict leads to social change. Class conflict may emerge in various forms that include direct violence; such as wars fought for resources and cheap labour, indirect violence; such as deaths from poverty, starvation, illness or unsafe working conditions

and, coercion; such as the threat of losing a job etc. In general, there are six elements in Marx's view of class conflict:

1. Classes are authority relationships based on property ownership.
2. A class defines groupings of individuals with shared life situations, thus interests.
3. Classes are naturally antagonistic by virtue of their interests.
4. Imminent within modern society is the growth of two antagonistic classes and their struggle, which eventually absorbs all social relations.
5. Political organization and Power is an instrumentality of class struggle, and reigning ideas are its reflection.
6. Structural change is a consequence of the class struggle.

The exclusive criterion on the basis of which the class of a person is determined is this ownership (or control) of means of production constitute the bourgeoisie (exploiters) and those who own labour power constitute the proletariat (exploited). It is apparent that Max explained classes on the basis of twin criteria of a person's place with mode of production and his consequent position in terms of relations of production.[xiv]

Marx made a distinction between the existence of class and class consciousness. Division of labour is the main source of historical development of classes and class antagonisms. Through a detailed historical analysis, Marx indicated that no major resentment disappears unless there emerges a new antagonism. General bitterness between rich and poor is there but in capitalism, it has been severely polarised into antagonism between the capitalist and the proletariat. Thus, in capitalism, the emergence of proletariat has a special consequence. It is not an ancient phenomenon because its suffering, its exploitation and determination is a pattern for the human conduct. The proletariat can abolish all classes and all class antagonisms by eliminating itself as a separate class. In the class struggle, the majority proletariat is successful. Marx and Engels wrote that "The workers of the world unite. The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win". Marx envisaged the emergence of a classless society, free from exploitation and suppression. Such class-less society will also be a state less society because with the vanishing of classes, rationale for the existence of state will also disappear.[xv]

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 02**

Question 01: Marx treated humans NOT as _________.

(a) rational beings
(b) slaves
(c) capitalists
(d) machines

Question 02: Marx envisaged the emergence of a ______________.

(a) classless society
(b) class society
(c) fragmented society
(d) peaceful society

Question 03: Highlight the six elements of Marx's view of class conflict.

1.4 Marx on the theory of state, capitalism, revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat

In this section, a detailed account of Marx's theory of the state, capitalism, revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat will be made which constitutes a core of Marxism.

1.4.1 Marx's theory of state

In simple terms, the institution of State refers to a legitimate power structure. The state is an institution which exercises unbridled power. Marx tried to outline the power of State and its role in a highly fragmented society characterised by capitalism. Marx's theory of the state (under capitalism) is probably the most important instance of his view that in mature capitalist societies, all major respectable, stable institutions are instruments of class rule. In the 'Communist Manifesto', he says that "the bourgeoisie has...conquered for itself in modern representative state, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" (Marx: 1974b, P. 69). Further, in the 'Civil War in France' he wrote that, in France, and by clear implication other capitalist societies, "the state power has assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organised for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism" (Marx: 1974d, P.207).[xvi] A careful analysis of these statements would allow one to understand that Marx viewed the state as an instrument of exploitation controlled by the capitalist class. To him, "it is organised power of one class for oppressing another".

The followers of Marx, while making attempts at understanding the institution of state developed two models viz. (a) Instrumentalist Model and (b) Relative autonomy model. To Marx and Engels, the state was created to defend primarily the economic interests of the capitalists and ultimately converted into an instrument to exert control over the labour class. From this perspective of the analysis of the State by Marx, the Marxists have inferred a particular model of Marxist theory of state called as the instrumentalist model. The core of this model is that the state is used as an instrument for purely fulfilling the interests of the bourgeoisie class. Ralph Miliband was the chief proponent of this model. The relative autonomy model on the other hand, signifies that though the capitalist state works as an instrument under the dominance of the bourgeoisie, it exercises its power autonomously. It means, the state is not always dictated by the capitalists or it does not discharge its functions at the behest of the bourgeoisie. The independent functioning of the state away from the influence of the economically dominant class is interpreted by the Marxists as the relative autonomy of state. Ralph Miliband also supported the relative autonomy of saying that the instrumentalist approach is very important, the relative autonomy model is not less important. Though Marx did not directly denote to the relative autonomy of state, but The German Ideology, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte contain sufficient hints about this.

Marx and Engels foreseen that the working class through 'class struggle' and 'revolution' would succeed in arresting capitalist state and establish communism. It did not happen entirely but in Russia the working class captured power. Plainly speaking, the Marxist theory of state serves as an instrument for the haves, who continuously suppress the working class. Karl Marx argued that most of the political power of the society is controlled by the bourgeois class and that politics is mainly a class conflict.

1.4.2 Marx on Capitalism

A society is capitalist, in Marx's way of thinking, if the production of material goods is dominated by the use of wage labour, that is, the use of labour power sold, to make a living, by people controlling no significant means of production and bought by other people who do have significant control over means of production and mostly gain their income from profits on the sale of the results of combining bought labour power with those productive means. The proletariat are roughly the first group. In the Communist Manifesto, he writes, "a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital". The bourgeoisie are roughly the second group, whose income mainly comes from the sale of commodities produced with bought labour power. Marx thinks that these relations of the control in the process of production have a pervasive influence on politics, culture and society.[xvii] For Marx, society enters into capitalism because of a transformation in the understanding of exchange value and of labour. In a barter society, goods are exchanged directly but in capitalism, the exchange of good is done on the basis of exchange-value rather than use-value. By translating value into exchange-value, the stage is set for the eventual dominance of first 'gold' and then 'paper money' as the universal equivalent of capitalist society. By accepting money as the universal equivalent, capitalism manages to exploit the labour class.

Marx's model of capitalism, despite its inherent contradictions provides a true account of social analysis.

1.4.3. Marx on revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat

Marx's analysis of revolution occupies a central position in Marxist theory. Marx and Engels have constantly stated that the liberation of the working class is never possible without the appropriation of state power and this can be done through a 'class struggle' leading to revolution. For Marx, revolution is the only solution to the problems that exist in a bourgeois society. The main objective of revolution is to capture the state power from the bourgeoisie class and then to establish complete authority of the working class. Once the working class captures power, they would radically change the bourgeois system embedded in the society. Marx, Engels and later on Lenin and Stalin also have viewed that that a single revolution by may not yield in desired results. Revolution must be enduring. It must be fought continuously unless communism i.e. the highest stage of socialism is achieved. Marx's theory of state and the theory of revolution are connected concepts. Marx viewed the state as an institution which seizes power and subjugates human beings. Such a state should not be eliminated in a forcible manner. The state power should be confined and the supreme authority of working class should be established. And in the next, all classes should compulsorily be abolished. When these twin objectives are achieved, there will be no importance of state, the state will wither away.

Before the elimination of the state, a very important stage which requires more analysis is the stage of 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Bertell Ollman (1989) quite succinctly summarised the concept 'dictatorship of the proletariat' forwarded by Marx. He stated that in capitalism, there is the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" (political power is in the hands of capitalists) and, despite the facade of popular rule, the mass of the workers have no real chance to participate in and affect government. In the "dictatorship of the proletariat" on the other hand, political power is held by the great majority, and once the former capitalists and landlords get production jobs they become workers and take part in the political process with the rest of the population.

The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is actually more democratic than democratic governments in capitalist societies.[xviii]

The 'dictatorship of the proletariat' comes in the wake of the revolution and exists until the onset of full communism. In plain terms, its prime task is to transform the capitalism left behind in all aspects viz. material and human into the full communist society. According to Marx, it functions as a 'permanent revolution'.

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 03**

Question 01: The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole________.

(a) proletariat
(b) bourgeoisie
(c) middle class
(d) serfs

Question 02: In __________, Marx writes, "a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital."

(a) The Class Struggles in France
(b) The German Ideology
(c) Critique of Political Economy
(d) The Communist Manifesto

Question 03: Write a note on Marx's view on the 'Dictatorship of Proletariat'.

1.5 Let Us Sum Up

In this unit, a detailed account of the significant contributions of Karl Marx has been made. After reading this, it is expected that you would be in a position to critically appreciate Marxism. It is clear that a retreat to Marxist aspirations is no longer possible because of innumerable reasons. It may be because of inherent contradictions exist in Marxist ideologies or may be because of the adherence to capitalism by many states as a plausible means of progress and development. But, by no means can one ignore the importance of Marxism as it has provided altogether an alternative perspective to analyse and explicate the state, society, social structures and social institutions.

1.6 Key Words

Bourgeoisie: the capitalist class who own most of society's wealth and means of production.
Proletariat: working-class people regarded collectively.
Capitalism: an economic and political system in which a country's trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit, rather than by the state.
Communism: Economic and social system in which all (or nearly all) property and resources are collectively owned by a classless society and not by individual citizens. Based on the 1848 publication 'Communist Manifesto' by two German political philosophers, Karl Marx (1818-1883) and his close associate Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), it envisaged common ownership of all land and capital and withering away of the coercive power of the state. In such a society, social relations were to be regulated on the fairest of all principles: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.
Serf: an agricultural labourer bound by the feudal system who was tied to working on his lord's estate.
Feudalism: the dominant social system in medieval Europe, in which the nobility held lands from the Crown in exchange for military service, and vassals were in turn

tenants of the nobles, while the peasants (serfs) were obliged to live on their lord's land and give him homage, labour, and a share of the produce, notionally in exchange for military protection.

1.7 Suggested Readings

- Worsley, Peter. Marx and Marxism, Routledge, London and New York, 2002
- Subrata Mukherjee and Ramaswamy Sushila, A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 2009
- Paul, Wolf Robert. Understanding Marx: A Reconstruction and Critique of Capital, Disha Publications, Delhi
- Berki, R.N., The Genesis of Marxism: Four Lectures, Everyman's University Library, London, P.5, 1988
- Cornforth, Maurice., Dialectical Materialism: An Introductory Course, National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd, Calcutta, 1971
- Erik Olin Wright, Andrew Levine and Elliot Sober, Reconstructing Marxism: Essays on Explanation and the Theory of History, Verso: London and New York, 1992
- Chandel, Bhuban., Marxian Ethics: Some Preliminary Considerations, Munshiram Manohorlal, Delhi, 1979
- Rosen, Michael, "Karl Marx", in Edward Craig (ed.), Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, London, 1998
- Ernest Mandel, "Karl Marx", 1990
- Slaughter, Cliff. *"Marxism & the Class Struggle",* New Park Publications, London, 1977
- Coser, Lewis A., Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977
- Terrell Carver (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Marx, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991.
- Ollman, Bertell, Marxism: An Uncommon Introduction", Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1989

Possible Answers to CYP

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 01**

Answer to Question No. 01: (b)

Answer to Question No. 02: (c)

Question 03: Write a note on Marx's materialist interpretation of the stages of history.

Answer: Karl Marx's theory of history sees human society as being fundamentally determined at any given time by its material conditions, or the relationships which people have with each other for producing and reproducing the means of human existence. Marx identified six successive stages of the development of these material conditions in Western Europe. These are: Primitive Communism, Slave Society, Feudalism, Capitalism, Socialism, and Communism.

First, for Marx, comes the stage of primitive communism, in which the mode of production is simply "a further extension of the natural division of labour existing in the family, with resources plentiful enough for the concept of individual 'ownership' of property not to exist." In the next stage i.e. the slave society, according to Marx slave exist but they are outside the family and hence, in a sense, exist outside of society. By the feudal stage of ownership the class-strata has expanded into a vast

social hierarchy creating two distinct classes-feudal lords and the serfs. In order for the bourgeoisie to fully exploit capital, the serfs must be freed from their hierarchical obligations; and thus, argues Marx, 'begins an epoch of social revolution'. With the end of feudalism comes Capitalism, which for Marx signifies the epitome of the inequality of class based society. With the proletariat uniting against the capitalists resorting to revolution, a brief stage called socialism would come. This stage is utopian in nature because while analysing the stages of history Marx also visualised a futuristic society. After Socialism, Marx believes, that Communism would become an inevitable phenomenon, where equality would be ensured and the state would wither away. Marx thoroughly analyzed capitalism as it was the stage he lived in and predicted that it would eventually be replaced by first Socialism and then Communism. Marx's theory of history is centred on the idea that forms of society rise and fall as they proceed, and then impede the development of human productive power.

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 02**

Answer to Question No 01: (d)

Answer to Question No 02: (a)

Question 03: **Highlight the six elements of Marx's view of class conflict.**

Answer: There are six elements in Marx's view of class conflict. These are as follows:

1. Classes are authority relationships based on property ownership.
2. A class defines groupings of individuals with shared life situations, thus interests.
3. Classes are naturally antagonistic by virtue of their interests.
4. Imminent within modern society is the growth of two antagonistic classes and their struggle, which eventually absorbs all social relations.
5. Political organization and Power is an instrumentality of class struggle, and reigning ideas are its reflection.
6. Structural change is a consequence of the class struggle.

*** Check Your Progress (CYP): 03**

Answer to Question No. 01: (b)

Answer to Question No. 02: (d)

Question 03: Write a note on Marx's view on the 'Dictatorship of Proletariat'.

Answer: Marx's 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is a very important contribution of his works. Bertell Ollman (1989) quite succinctly summarised the concept 'dictatorship of the proletariat' forwarded by Marx. He stated that in capitalism, there is the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" (political power is in the hands of capitalists) and, despite the facade of popular rule, the mass of the workers have no real chance to participate in and affect government. In the "dictatorship of the proletariat" on the other hand, political power is held by the great majority, and once the former capitalists and landlords get production jobs they become workers and take part in the political process with the rest of the population. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is actually more democratic than democratic governments in capitalist societies.

Model Questions:

1. What do you mean by Dialectics? Discuss the influence of Hegel on Marx in developing his ideas on dialectical materialism.
2. Discuss Marx's viewpoint on historical materialism.

3. Why the concept of ‘alienation’ is central to Marxism? Discuss.
4. Write a short note on Marx’s Theory of Surplus Value.
5. Critically analyse Marx’s view on class struggle.
6. What do you mean by the State? Discuss Marx’s theory of State.
7. Write a note on capitalism. Explain Marx’s interpretation of capitalism.
8. What would happen if ‘revolution’ occurs? Critically examine Marx’s concept of ‘revolution’.

References:

Worsley, Peter. Marx and Marxism, Routledge, London and New York, 2002, P.1

Paul, Wolf Robert. Understanding Marx: A Reconstruction and Critique of Capital, Disha Publications, Delhi, P.3

Berki, R.N., The Genesis of Marxism: Four Lectures, Everyman’s University Library, London, P.5, 1988

Cornforth, Maurice., Dialectical Materialism: An Introductory Course, National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd, Calcutta, 1971, P.46

P. Rashmi, “Marx’s Ideas on Dialectical Materialism” accessed from http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/sociology/marxs-ideas-on-dialectical-materialism/43765/

Erik Olin Wright, Andrew Levine and Elliot Sober, Reconstructing Marxism: Essays on Explanation and the Theory of History, Verso: London and New York, 1992, P.13

Nicki L. Cole, Definition of Base and Superstructure: Core Concepts of Marxists Theory accessed from https://www.thoughtco.com/definition-of-base-and-superstructure-3026372

Chandel, Bhuban., Marxian Ethics: Some Preliminary Considerations, Munshiram Manohorlal, Delhi, 1979, p.59

Rosen, Michael, “Karl Marx”, in Edward Craig (ed.), Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, London, 1998 accessed from http:// ricardo.ecn.w fu.edu/~cottrell/ ecn265/rosen_on_marx.pdf

Ernest Mandel, “Karl Marx”, 1990 accessed from https://www. ernestmandel. org/en/works/txt/1990/karlmarx/7.htm

Vitaly Vygodsky, “Surplus Value”, 2014, accessed from https://www.marxists.org/ archive/vygodsky/unknown/surplus_value.htm)

Slaughter, Cliff. *“Marxism & the Class Struggle”,* New Park Publications, London, 1977

Coser, Lewis A., Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977, p.48

http://www.civilserviceindia.com/Political-Science/western-political-thought-karl-marx.html

ibid

Miller, Richard W., ‘‘Social and Political Theory: Class, state, revolution’’ in The Cambridge Companion to Marx, Terrell Carver (ed.), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991, Pp.65-66

Miller, Richard W., ‘‘Social and Political Theory: Class, state, revolution’’ in The Cambridge Companion to Marx, Terrell Carver (ed.), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991, P.55

Ollman, Bertell, Marxism: An Uncommon Introduction”, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1989, p 23

UNIT-II

V.I. LENIN

Structure

2.0 Objectives

After reading this unit you will be able to

- Understand the Political Philosophy of Lenin
- Discuss Lenin's theory of Party
- Explain Lenin's theory of Imperialism
- Discuss Lenin's theory of Revolution
- Understand Lenin's theory of Dictatorship of Proletariat
- Analyze Lenin's idea on state
- Evaluate Lenin's view on right of nations to Self Determination

2.1 Introduction

In the previous unit, you studied about Karl Marx, the father of Marxist theory. In this unit, you will learn about the political philosophies of V.I. Lenin. Lenin was a revolutionary, politician and the greatest theoretician of the Marxist school in the 20th Century. He made necessary revisions of Classical Marxism in order to apply to his country and developed 'Leninism', which is considered to be further development of Marxism. He laid great stress on the principle that theory should have a bearing in practical life. He believed that theory should be moulded as to suit time and circumstances. His political ideas are contained in a number of pamphlets and monographs. He made a creative study of new economic, political and ideological phenomena in the light of the Marxist doctrine. Lenin gave a new interpretation to basic philosophies of Marx. Under his administration, Soviet Union became a one-party communist state governed by the Russian Communist Party. He attached more importance in practice than to theory. This unit discusses the important theories espoused by Lenin.

2.2 A Brief life sketch of Lenin

Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, known as Lenin (He adopted the pseudonym "Lenin") was born on 22nd April, 1870 to the family of Ilya Nikolayevich Ulyanov who held the post of a school inspector. Lenin's elder brother Aleksandr was hanged for conspiring against the government. As a reaction to this incident, Lenin embraced revolutionary socialist politics. Lenin's political philosophy was coupled with a long and multifaceted background. He came in close contact with the works of Marx and Plekhanov. Phelkanov built a powerful group of Marxists and elaborated, interpreted and propagated the Marxist thoughts. Lenin also witnessed a lot of revolutionaries and socialist thinkers such as Struve, Martov, and Potresov etc. His attachment with revolutionary philosophy in general and Marxian ideology particular began to increase and he became a known figure in the socialist circle. At the same time, he also had connection with secret organizations particularly Narodnaya Volya. After competing his graduation, he studied Law at Kazan University from where he was expelled for participating in protest against the Russian Empire's Tsarist government (later he completed as an External Student). He moved to St. Petersburg in 1893 and tried to unite the various revolutionary groups. But, he was arrested and sent to Siberia. He became a senior member Marxist Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP). At, the same time he felt the need of a journal to spread and inculcate the principles of revolution among the workers and with the help of other Marxists like Potresov and Martov he published a journal called *Iskra* (The Sparkle) which later became Russia's most successful underground publication with writings from prominent European Marxists. In the second Congress of RSDLP a schism emerged between Lenin's supporters and those of Julius Martov on issues of concerns. Martov argued that party

members should be able to express themselves independently, whereas Lenin emphasized a strong leadership. As, Lenin's supporters were in majority, he used the term Bolsheviks (meaning majoritarian in Russian), and in response Martov termed his followers Mensheviks (minoritarian in Russian), both the factions accusing each other. The revolution of 1905 and the two revolutions of 1919 corroborated Lenin's fundamental law. At the time of 1905 revolution, Lenin urged Bolsheviks to take a greater role in the events, encouraging violent insurrection. As the revolution failed, Lenin investigated the causes for failure of revolution and stated his conclusions in *Lessons of Revolution* published in 1910. In due course, 1917 February revolution ousted the Tsar and established a Provincial Government. In October, 1917 the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin marched ahead and captured power.

Although the Bolsheviks initially shared power with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries, elected Soviets and a multi-party Constituent Assembly, by 1918 it had centralized power in the new Communist Party. Thereafter, Lenin played a leading role in the October revolution, 1917. He served as Head of government of the Russian Republic from 1917 to 1918, of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic from 1918 to 1924 and of the Soviet Union from 1922 to 1924. He died on 21st January, 1924 at his Gorki home.

His notable works are – What is to be done? (1902); One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (1904); The Right of Nations to Self-Determination (1914); the State and Revolution (1917), Imperialism, the highest stage of Capitalism (1917).

2.3 Lenin's Theory of Party

The theme of the Party and its organization was the subject of Lenin's important pamphlet entitled '*What is to be done?*' (published in 1902 in *Iskra).* Lenin was of the view that without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. Thus, there is the need of the party to indoctrinate the working class and organize them for the revolution to establish the rule of proletariats. Lenin stated 'The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization'. Although, at the beginning of the 20th century in Russia there were a number of Revolutionary groups against the Tsardom, but Lenin felt the necessity of a unified centralized well organized united party to capture political power. He believed that without a disciplined 'iron party' it was impossible to carry out the dictatorship of the proletariats. Therefore he put forwarded his theory of the party. For Lenin, the Communist party will be the 'Vanguard of the working Class'. Various aspects of his theory can be discussed as –

The party should be small so that it can function effectively. The central committee will dominate the ideological and other aspects of the party.

The party is to consist of professional revolutionaries (basically workers) whose allegiance to both party and ideology shall be beyond suspicion.

The basis of the party should be 'democratic centralism'. All organizations of the party are to be subordinate to the central authority. The office-bearers are to be elected by members of the party. The party will guide and lead the Soviets.

2.4 Lenin's Theory of Imperialism

Lenin wrote his pamphlet Imperialism, the highest stage of Capitalism in January-June 1916 was published in April 1917. According to Lenin, Capitalism has assumed the character of monopoly and this is the highest stage of capitalism. He considered it be a 'moribund stage'. According to him, Imperialism is the monopoly stage of Capitalism. In this stage monopolistic export capital gain is prime importance.

He focused basically on the unprecedented growth of finance capitals. The financial capital is the bank capital of few monopolistic banks. He was of the view that the capitalist countries annexed territories not for the sale of the commodities but for export of finance capital. For him, the industrialists do not control the financial markets. They obtain the use if it through the medium of banks and other financial institutions. The owner of financial capital obtains huge profit.

Some features of imperialism as highlighted by Lenin-

- the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play decisive role in economic life.
- the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and creating on the basis of this 'financial capita' of financial oligarchy.
- formation of international monopolistic capitalist which shares the world among themselves
- territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers

He states that imperialism dominates monopolies and financial capital. The big powers in order to capture the market for export of financial capital are set to divide the territories of the world.

Lenin considered Imperialism as decaying or moribund capitalism as the monopolies came to compete with themselves for territories. The monopolies did not want to confine themselves to their national territories. Therefore, with this idea he considered First World War as an imperialist war.

2.5 Lenin on Social Revolution

Lenin focuses on revolution for the emancipation of the working class. For this, he put forward the idea of social revolution. Social revolutions are vital turning points in history. They change the whole social, economic and political structure of the society. It implies a qualitative leap in the development of society resulting in replacement of one social economic foundation by another. It not only replaces one ruling class by another, but abolishes old relation of production and introduces new ones. The revolution radically changes social views and institutions. It differs from the revolution merely against the bourgeoisie which only considers replacing the ruling class but do not touches the relations of production. He asserted that from the democratic revolution the revolution will turn to socialist revolution depending on the strength, class consciousness and organized proletariat.

Marx and Engels gave primary importance to the objective conditions of revolution, but also considered the subjective conditions too. However, Lenin very elaborately discussed the subjective and objective factors of revolution. He was of the view that both these factors are intimately connected and a juxtaposition of both causes the occurrence of a revolution. On objective conditions, Lenin also opined that there must arise a revolutionary situation when the contradictions between the classes became extremely actuate. Lenin, in his work The Collapse of the Second International (published in journal *Kommunist* 1915) discussed various symptoms of the Revolutionary situations:

- A crisis in the upper ruling classes, when it is impossible to maintain their rule without a change
- The suffering of the oppressed classes and their wants have grown more acute and suffering would be intolerable

The above factors would arise increasing activities of the masses. Lenin has pointed out that the rapid progress of capitalism has divided the world. In order to

maximize the profits the capitalists came into conflict with each other and this conflict weakened the foundation of capitalist system giving opportunity to the working class.

Lenin considered that only objective conditions are not sufficient for social revolution. He pointed out various subjective factors of revolution which are connected to the objective factors. Some subjective factors are –

- revolutionary consciousness of the masses and their determination to carry on the struggle till the end
- the organization of the masses and guided by vanguard party make possible the victory of revolution
- the leadership of the party must be experienced and trained. So that correct strategy can be adopted.

Lenin removed the idea that Marxism is possible only in advanced capitalist societies. He considered it to be possible in any country provide that revolutionary situation exist there and a revolutionary party exist to guide the society on the road to socialism. The revolution of 1905 and the two revolutions of 1917 corroborate Lenin's fundamental views on Revolution.

Check your progress - 1

1. What Lenin meant by 'Democratic Centralism' within the party?
2. Name some of Lenin's major works.
3. What are the subjective factors of revolution discussed by Lenin?

2.6 Lenin's theory of Dictatorship of Proletariat

Lenin took up the issue of dictatorship of Proletariats very much enthusiastically from the writings of Marx and Engels. He was of the view that by coming to power the first task of proletariat would be to abolish the state as state i.e. it will abolish the coercive aspects of the state. Lenin, referring to Marx's work *A Critique of Gotha Programme* discussed the dictatorship of proletariat. According to Lenin, Dictatorship of Proletariat is the political form appropriate to the transitional period which lies between the abolition of the bourgeois state and the establishment of communist society. He says that in this stage the state will be used by the proletariats to suppress the counter revolutionary forces. For Lenin, after capturing the political power, the proletariats will use the state for the purpose of class struggle. By using the state the proletariats will take all steps to destroy the remnants of capitalist. Lenin was of the view that, mere establishment of Dictatorship of Proletariat in one country is not enough precondition for its survival. The aim of Dictatorship of Proletariat should not merely be to suppress the counter revolutionaries, but also to utilize the progressive elements of the bourgeoisie for realization of the purpose. Lenin viewed that seizing power by proletariat is not enough in the era of imperialism. Therefore, national war must be converted to international war. In this era of Dictatorship of proletariat, he emphasized on the conversions of representative institutions into 'working bodies' in the true sense. He also emphasized on 'accounting and control' during the period.

2.7 Lenin on state

A very important contribution of Lenin lies in his interpretation and elaboration of the concept of state. He borrowed the idea from Marx and Engels and extends it further in his work *'The State and Revolution'*. Following Marx and Engels he says that in the primitive society there was no existence of state as there was no class. As a result of emergence of private property, class emerged and thus the necessity of state emerged. State is thus considered as an apparatus for coercing

people. Like Marx and Engels, Lenin has viewed history from standpoint of materialist conception and of classes at different phases of history. According to Lenin, although the state represents the powerful class, it sometimes plays the role of arbitrator in cases of dispute. But, ultimately it fails to do so as these cannot be reconciled. When the settlement fails, the state takes the side of the dominant class, exposing its real character. He concluded that state is an organ of class rule and product of class antagonism. It keeps itself above the society and rule from above. Therefore, the emancipation of the ruling class shall be preceded by destruction of ruling class and seizure of state power. On the concept of withering away of state, Lenin in his '*State and Revolution'* offered a clear exposition. Lenin was of the opinion that, after the proletarian Revolution the bourgeois state will abolish. But, state will not wither away immediately. Lenin says that the proposition 'state withers away' is mainly directed against the opportunist and anarchists who uses the state as an instrument of oppression. The proletarians after seizing power will retain some elements of state for its convenience. But, in the transitional phase, the working class will need the state to suppress the resistance of the exploiters. It would be an instrument to liquidate all reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces. For Lenin, the dictatorship of Proletariat is not the end. It will prohibit exploitation of any kind and remove all social and economic evils that prevailed in the bourgeois society. After socialist revolution there will be no classes and the proletarian state will be a symbol of perfect democracy. In this perfect democracy there will be no need of any state apparatus. Lenin, by interpreting the Marxian theory of state was successful in removing the confusions in the theory.

2.8 Lenin's views on Right to self-Determination

Lenin, in his book *the Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (1914) analyzed both the theoretical and practical aspects of this right. He defines the concept as – Self determination of nation mean the political separation of these nations from the national bodies and the formation of an independent nation state. He emphasized on the right to free political separation from the oppressed nation. Lenin opined that, if an individual can claim democratic and political right, than a nation consisting of millions of individuals can legitimately claim political separation. While supporting the right to self determination, he also emphasized that the demand should be considered exclusively on the basis of merit of each particular case. Lenin emphasized that if a community of people is oppressed and harassed by the bourgeoisies in the name of nationalist policy, the proletariats should come forward in support of the oppressed nation for its demand for self-determination.

Check your progress – 2

1. What is Dictatorship of Proletariats according to Lenin?
2. Why will the working class need the state in the transitional phase, according to Lenin?
3. Did Lenin support Right to Self Determination?

2.9 Let us sum up

- V.I. Lenin was a revolutionary, politician and the greatest theoretician of the Marxist school in the 20th Century.
- Lenin's notable works are – *What is to be done? (1902)*; *the State and Revolution (1917), Imperialism, the highest stage of Capitalism (1917).*

- Lenin made necessary revisions of Classical Marxism in order to apply to his country and developed 'Leninism', which is considered to be further development of Marxism.
- Lenin focuses on revolution for the emancipation of the working class. He considered it to be social revolution which signifies fundamental changes in the social system. Lenin very elaborately discussed the subjective and objective factors of revolution. He was of the view that both these factors are intimately connected.
- Lenin removed the idea that Marxism is possible only in advanced capitalist societies and considered it to be possible in any country provide that revolutionary situation exist there and a revolutionary party exist to guide the society on the road to socialism.
- Lenin felt that there is the need of the party to indoctrinate the working class and organize them for the revolution to establish the rule of proletariats. As such, the Communist party will be the 'Vanguard of the working Class'
- According to Lenin, Imperialism is the monopoly stage of Capitalism. In this stage monopolistic export capital gain is prime importance. He was of the view that the capitalist countries annexed territories not for the sale of the commodities but for export of finance capital.
- Lenin considered Imperialism as decaying or moribund capitalism as the monopolies came to compete with themselves for territories. Therefore, with this idea he considered First World War as an imperialist war.
- Lenin borrowed the idea from Marx and Engels and extends it further in his work *'The State and Revolution'*. As a result of emergence of private property, class emerged and thus the necessity of state emerged. State is thus considered as an apparatus for coercing people. Lenin has viewed history from standpoint materialist conception and of classes at different phases of history.

2.10 Key words

Bolsheviks: The Bolsheviks were a faction of Marxist Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) which slit at the Second Party Congress in 1903. In Russian language Bolshevik means 'majority'. It later became the communist party of Soviet Union. They later became the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They seized control of government in Russia in 1917.

Mensheviks: The Mensheviks were a liberal non-Leninist faction of Marxist Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) which slit in 1903 which. Julies Martov led the Mensheviks. It means 'minority' in Russian language.

Soviet: The word basically means a 'council'. It was used to mean a revolutionary Council of workers or peasants in Russia before 1917. In some instances it was also used to refer to citizen of former Soviet Union.

Proletariat: In Marxist theory, the proletariat is a social class that does not have ownership of the means of production and they sell their labor power for wage and salary. A member of such a class is a proletarian. (Workers, working-class people, wage-earners, the laboring classes are synonymous used)

Bourgeoisie: In Marxist philosophy the bourgeoisie is the wealthy social class owns the means of production.

Financial capital: Financial capital is the money, credit and other forms of funding that companies use in their business. It is the capital controlled by banks and employed by industrialists.

Financial oligarchy: Financial oligarchy is the elite of the monopolistic bourgeisis who are major owners of Capital. The financial oligarchy arises from the blending of industrial and banking capital. They exercise control over vast amounts of social capital and wealth. They also control the activities of commercial and industrial corporations, financial institutions and multinational corporations.

2.11 Suggested Readings

- Sabine George H & Thomas L Thorson *A History of Political Theory,* New Delhi, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd
- Fisher Louis, *The Life of Lenin*, New York: Harper and Row
- Trotsky Leon, *Lenin: Notes for a Biographer,* London: Harrap Publishers
- Das P.G. *History of Political Thought, Kolkata*: New Central Book agency
- Hoffman John, *A Glossary of Political Theory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Mishra K.K. and Kalpana M. Iyengar, *Modern Political Theory*: New Delhi: S. Chand & Company

Possible Answers to 'Check your Progress'

Check your progress - 1

1. According to Lenin, the basis of the party should be 'democratic centralism'. All organizations of the party are to be subordinate to the central authority. The office-bearers are to be elected by members of the party.
2. Some major works of Lenin are - *What is to be done? (1902); the State and Revolution (1917), Imperialism, the highest stage of Capitalism (1917)*
3. Some subjective factors of Social Revolution put forwarded by Lenin are –
   - revolutionary consciousness of the masses and their determination to carry on the struggle till the end
   - The organization of the masses and guided by vanguard party make possible the victory of revolution
   - The leadership of the party must be experienced and trained. So that correct strategy can be adopted.

Check your progress- 2

1. According to Lenin, Dictatorship of Proletariat is the political form appropriate to the transitional period which lies between the abolition of the bourgeoisies state and the establishment of communist society.
2. According to Lenin, the working class will need the state to suppress the resistance of the exploiters. It would be an instrument to liquidate all reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces. Moreover, it will prohibit exploitation of any kind and remove all social and economic evils that prevailed in the bourgeoisies' society.
3. Yes, Lenin supported the Right of Nations to Self Determination. He emphasized on the right to free political separation from the oppressed nation. But, while supporting the right to self determination, he also emphasized that the demand should be considered exclusively on the basis of merit of each particular case.

Model Question

1. Give a brief life sketch of Lenin.
2. Discuss Lenin’s theory of Party.
3. According to Lenin, ‘Imperialism is the highest stage of Capitalism’. Explain
4. Explain in your own words, what Lenin meant by Social Revolution.
5. Analyze the idea of ‘Dictatorship of Proletariat’, as explained by Lenin.
6. Discuss Lenin’s view on State.
7. Evaluate Lenin’s view on the right of nations to Self Determination

Unit-III

MAO ZE-DONG

Structure:

3.0 Objectives

After reading this unit you will be able to

- Understand the Political Philosophy of Mao Zedong
- Discuss Mao's views on Contradiction
- Discuss Mao' views on Revolution
- Explain Mao's concept of New Democracy
- Analyze Cultural Revolution of China

3.1 Introduction:

In the last unit, you have studied about V.I. Lenin who was a Russian communist revolutionary, politician and a political theorist. In this unit, you will learn about the political philosophies of the Chinese revolutionary leader Mao Zedong.

Mao Zedong, was the founding father of the People's Republic of China. Mao was a thinker, a revolutionary, a strategist and a statesman. He devoted himself to propagate Communism in China and developed a version of communism to suit it in his country. His philosophy, 'Maoism' is a blending of Marxism-Leninism with the nationalist sentiment. The ideological elements of Maoism were the Chinese historical and cultural traditions; Marxism-Leninism; the experience of contemporary political and economic history of China. Mao made Communism a living philosophy. Mao turned China into a powerful nation and took various steps to raise the living standards of the people. His ideas were accepted by the people and served the purpose for which t was given by this great leader. This chapter will try to highlight the life of Mao and also give you a brief idea about the political philosophies of Mao.

3.2 A Brief life sketch of Mao

Mao Zedong or Mao Tse- tung (also known as Chairman Mao) was born on 26th December, 1893 in a family of peasants in Shoashan, Hunan Province. The childhood sufferings of Mao compelled him to think of removing injustice from the society. He was greatly influenced by the Glorious history of China and heroic activities of George Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, Peter the Great. Moreover, he was unhappy with the highlight about the achievements of rulers in the books, but there was no mention about the sacrifices made by the peasants. This created sympathy in him for these people and left house to work among the peasants. During the period he saw the ill treatment of the rulers towards the people in famine stricken society and inspired by Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen decided to join revolutionary army. He participated in the Xinhai revolution of 1911. As a member of the revolutionary army he understood that without military strength political power could not be captured. The works of Marx, Engels and Lenin ignited his revolutionary feeling. Moreover, serving in Hunnan Library he got the opportunity of reading the works of Adam Smith, Darwin, Herbert Spencer and other thinkers. He thereafter, created New People's Study Society which was subsequently responsible for producing prominent Communist leaders of China. In the mid-20 of the 20th century revolutionary activities came up in various countries which inspired Mao to launch a Peasant movement in China. In 1921 the Communist Party of China was founded and Mao was among the top leaders invited to the first congress of the Party. In 1930 he became the Chairman of Laborers and Peasants committee. He organised the Red Army and organised attack against Chiang-Kai-Shek. In 1935, he started the Long March of 6000 miles which paved the establishment of a communist under the leadership of Mao. In 1944 he became the Chairman of the Central Committee of Chinese Communist Party. His struggle with Chiang for power continued till 1949 when Chiang was forced to leave

china. In 1949 he was elected the President of Central Peoples Government of People's Republic of China. Under Mao's leadership, the CPC fought the Japanese forces invading China and even made the reactionaries Chiang-Kai-Shek join a united front against Japan. He governed People's Republic of China from its establishment in 1949 until his death in 1976. He launched the Initial classicide (fight the landlord) in 1947; the Three Anti Campaign (1951) and Five anti campaign (1952); the Hundred Flowers campaign (1956); the Anti –Rightist campaign (1957); the Great Leap forward (1958-1962) and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-76). He died on 9th September, 1976 in Beijing at the age of at the age of 82 years suffering a series of heart attacks.

His major contributions towards political philosophy are *'On Practice and Contradiction (1937); On Guerilla Warfare (1937); Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung (1964); 'On New Democracy* (1967); *On Protracted War (1967) etc.*

3.3 Mao on Contradiction:

In 1937, Mao wrote an article – *On Contradiction*. He was of the view that in order to study the nature of the problem society faces, one must acquire sufficient knowledge of contradictions. Mao while referring to 'Two world Outlook' contends that there are two views concerning the laws of development – the metaphysical (it considers that the things of the world and species are isolated, changeless and static) and dialectical (study of development of things and from relationship of one to another). The dialectical holds that the world of things changes as a result of internal contradictions. Mao classified contradictions into two kinds – Non-Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved by discussion and negations) and Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved only by Revolution or War). Moreover, qualitatively different contradictions can be solved by different methods, e.g. contradiction between proletariats and bourgeoisies can be solved by Socialist revolutions. According to Mao, with the change of process new contradictions emerge and new methods emerge too. Solution of contradiction is related to qualitative change in the matter or society through 'relative rest' and 'conspicuous change'. The qualitative change of matter (or society) brings an end to the struggle. This qualitative change in a society occurs only after revolution becomes scientific because it brings about an end in the struggle of opposites and qualitative change.

3.4 Mao on Revolution:

Mao explained about Revolution in his work *On Contradiction* (1937). In his view Revolution is chiefly caused by internal contradictions of the society. Like Marx, Engels and Lenin, Mao was of the view that the workers and peasants must seize state power which can bring an end to exploitation. Like Lenin, Mao was also of the opinion that party is indispensible for revolution and he emphasized on the correctness of the political party on its own political line. For Mao, revolution is an act of violence by which one class overthrows another. This is the central idea of his techniques of revolution. Appeal and compromise have no palace in his theory. He was in fact champion of violent revolution. In his *Little Red Book* he said that Political Power comes from the barrel of the gun. Mao adopted the Guerilla warfare against the enemy. Visiting China's countryside and realizing that it could not be possible to defeat Imperialist in face to face armed conflict, he adopted Guerilla warfare. For Mao, China's peasantry constituted the chief oppressed class as the number of industrial workers were less. Therefore, in China the class struggle was basically led

by the peasants. Mao believed that revolutionary war and guerilla war will be converted to people's war.

Check your progress - 1

1. What Mao meant by Antagonistic and Non-Antagonistic differences?
2. Highlight the major works of Mao.
3. What was the central idea of Mao's technique of Revolution?

3.5 Mao on New Democracy:

Mao discussed about the concept in his work '*On New Democracy*' (1967). This 80 pages document became the basis of new government in China. It tried to establish national unity and integrity in China in the regime of the new government. New Democracy can be considered as Joint or Democratic Dictatorship of Proletariats. The idea of 'dictatorship of Proletariat' by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, becomes 'Joint or Democratic Dictatorship of the proletariats' according to Mao. He did so to harmonize his socialism with the political and economic culture of his countrymen. It may also be called 'joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes'. Mao was of the view that, after the revolution of 1949, a new democracy would be established in China in which all sections of the people would have the opportunities to share their responsibilities of the government. Politically New democracy is the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes and economically it will follow various principles like-regulation of capital; equalization of land ownership. The authority of the new democracy will assure the ownership of all big banks and commercial enterprises. The state will neither confiscate property of capitalists nor will restrict the production but will ensure that the workers are not exploited. It will eliminate feudalism and monopoly capitalism and not capitalism as a whole. As such, there will be the existence of semi-proletariat and petty-bourgeoisies provided such segments are prepared to live under the control of the Communist Party.

The New democracy will make effort to raise the cultural level of peasants and workers. It will encourage assistance to peasants and workers. He was of the view that, a slave culture society prevailed in China and the Capitalist and feudalists writers supported the culture. But, the new culture which comes with New Democracy will protect national character and bring socialist cultures together respecting the working class. Mao gave a clear concept of society which will become the basis of a different version of democracy to suit China, which he calls the New Democracy in China.

3.6 Mao and Cultural Revolution:

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was launched in the middle of 1966 under the leadership of Mao. The basic objective of Cultural Revolution was to change the human nature. Masses of Red Guards were organized to propagate this revolution. The mass movement in the form of Cultural Revolution was initiated by Mao for the attainment of certain ideological goals. He also targeted to fight bureaucratic revisionist tendencies which gained control of party and administration. Therefore, it became necessary to mobilize the broad mass against the sinister phenomenon. The masses comprising workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals and revolutionary cadres form the main forces of Cultural Revolution. Mao like Engels made distinction between Base and Superstructure. The base is the economic foundation of the society, whereas the institutions, organizations are the superstructures. Normally, the base influences the superstructures, but very often the superstructures influence the base. He modified this in the background of Chinese society. Mao observed that even after

the establishment of Socialist economic Base in China, the superstructures failed to respond satisfactorily. Therefore, he and his followers felt the need to change the superstructures to correspond to the base of Chinese society. As such, he was in support of eliminating the anti-socialist forces. For Mao, without socialist man motivated by socialist impulse, a socialist system cannot be consolidated. Therefore, he felt the need of following the pure socialist strategies without any compromise with the revisionist. The Central Committee of CPC also took certain decisions on 8th august, 1966 in this regard, such as - the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolution and touches people to their soul; Party leaders should educate the people; Reform non-socialist education system etc. as part of the revolution millions of people were persecuted in violent struggles. Mao also put forwarded various ideas about cultural revolution like- Full attention should be paid to development of children; the women labour power of china should be fully utilized; there should be cooperative production; anarchy in economic fields be replaced by planning for interest of society. During the Cultural Revolution, there were wide ranges of abuses, arbitrary imprisonment, torture, seizure of property ad even execution which resulted in displacement of large sections of populations.

3.7 Some campaigns initiated by Chairman Mao:

Mao Zedong initiated some campaigns as Chairman of Communist Party of China:

Three Anti Campaign: Reform movement originally issued by Mao in 1951. It was aimed at members within the Communist party of China, former Kuomintang members and bureaucratic officials who were not party members. The three-anti imposed were- corruption; Waste and Bureaucracy.

Five Anti Campaign: It was launched in 1952 and targeted the bourgeoisies in China. The five anti were - bribery; theft of state property; tax evasion; cheating on government contracts; stealing state economic information.

The Hundred Flowers campaign: Launched in 1956, it was a campaign when the citizens were encouraged to express their opinion on communist regime. Differing views and solutions were encouraged. Mao believed that each thinking was a flower and in China, it must let such hundred flowers blossom and grow.

The Anti –rightist Campaign: It was instigated by Mao in 1957. During the Hundred flowers campaign, people expressed their opinions and even criticized the government. These persons were leveled as rightists and their penalties included informal criticism, hard labor and even execution.

The Great Leap forward: It was an economic and social campaign by the Communist Part of China, from 1958 to 1962 under the leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong. The campaign was aimed to rapidly transform the country from agrarian economy into a socialist society through rapid industrialization. .

3.8 Assessment of Mao:

Mao Zedong was a revolutionary, statesman and political theorist who put forwarded theories to continue the legacy of Marxism with a signified form to suit his country. Mao became a Marxist in his early years and in the later period governed China according to his philosophy ‘Maoism’. He interpreted Marxian principles in the light of the Chinese conditions. With regard to Marxism in China, he was of the view that foreign stereotypes be replaced by fresh lively Chinese spirit of the common

people. Moreover, As a Leninist he places the masses under the iron hold of the Communist party. As a leader he has earned great appreciation for leading a successful revolution to establish the Republic of China. He gave a powerful political system to China and inculcated among his people a sense of loyalty towards the ideals to which the nation was committed. For the people he writes 'I have witnessed the tremendous energy of the masses. On this foundation it is possible to accomplish any task whatsoever'.

Check your progress- 2

1. What is democratic centralism in the vanguard party?
2. Why Lenin call imperialism as decaying capitalism?

3.9 Let us sum up:

- Mao Zedong, who was the founding father of the People's Republic of China. Mao was a thinker, a revolutionary, a strategist and a statesman. His philosophy 'Maoism' is defined as a signified version of Marxism-Leninism.
- Mao launched the Initial classicide (fight the landlord) in 1947; the Great Leap forward (1958-1962) and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-76).
- His major contributions towards political philosophy are *'On Practice and Contradiction (1937); On Guerilla Warfare (1937); Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung (1964); 'On New Democracy* (1967); *On Protracted War (1967) etc.*
- Mao classified contradictions into two kinds – Non-Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved by discussion and negations) and Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved only by Revolution or War). Solution of contradiction is related to qualitative change in the matter or society.
- According to Mao, revolution is an act of violence by which one class overthrows another. This is the central idea of his techniques of revolution. Appeal and compromise have no palace in his theory. He was in fact champion of violent revolution.
- For Mao, after the revolution of 1949, a new democracy would be established in China in which all sections of the people would have the opportunities to share their responsibilities of the government. New democracy in the political arena is the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes and economically it will follow various principles like- regulation of capital; equalization of land ownership etc.
- The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was launched in the middle of 1966 under the leadership of Mao. He and his followers felt the need to change the superstructures to correspond to the base of Chinese society. Therefore, he was in support of eliminating the anti-socialist forces and attains ideological goals through Cultural Revolution.
- Mao Zedong was a revolutionary, statesman and political theorist who put forwarded theories to continue the legacy of Marxism with a signified form to suit his country. Mao became a Marxist in his early years and in the later period governed China according to his philosophy 'Maoism'.
- As a leader Mao has earned great appreciation for leading a successful revolution to establish the Republic of China. He gave a powerful political system to China and inculcated among his people a sense of loyalty towards the ideals to which the nation was committed.

3.10 Key words:

Xinhai revolution: also known as Chinese revolution or the revolution of 1911, was a revolution to overthrow Qing Dynasty (Last Imperal dynasty of China) and establish the Republic of China. The revolution was named Xinhai because it occurred in the year of Xinhai, stem branch in the sexagenary cycle of Chinese Calender. The revolution marked the end of imperial rule of 2,000 years and beginning of China's earlier republican era.

Classicide: classicide is the deliberate and systematic destruction of a social class through persecution and violence. As Part of Mao Zedong's land reform of the early People's Republic of China, classicide was launched targeting landlords in order to redistribute the lands to the peasants. It resulted in millions of death.

People's War: The People's War also known as protracted war, is a military-political strategy developed by Mao Zedong. The basic concept is to maintain the support of the population. It was used by the communist against Imperial Japanese Army in World War II and the Nationalist Government in the Chinese Civil War.

Guerilla warfare: It is a form of irregular warfare in which small group of combatants use military tactics of ambushes, hit-and-run tactics, raids and mobility to fight a less mobile traditional military.

Little Red Book: The Little Red Book is also known '*Quotations from Chairman Mao'* is a book containing selected statements and writings of Chairman Mao. The popular versions were printed in small size so that it can be carried easily and this became to be known as Little Red Book.

Peasant: Peasant is an agricultural labour or farmer under feudalism and paying tax, rent fees to the landlords.

Proletariat: In Marxist theory, the proletariat is a social class that does not have ownership of the means of production and they sell their labor power for wage and salary. A member of such a class is a proletarian. (Workers, working-class people, wage-earners, the laboring classes are synonymous used)

Bourgeoisie: In Marxist philosophy the bourgeoisie is the social class that came to own the means of production.

Chinese Red Army: The Chinese Workers' and Peasants Red Army, commonly known an Red Army, was the armed forces of the Communist Party of China. After World War II, the Red Army was renamed the People's Liberation Army. (People's Liberation Army is the armed forces of the People's Republic of China)

3.11 Suggested readings

- Sabine George H & Thomas L Thorson, *A History of Political Theory,* New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt.Ltd
- Das P.G. *History of Political Thought,* Kolkata: New Central Book agency
- Lucian W. Pye, *Mao Tse-Tung: The Man in the Leader*, New York: Basic Books
- Phukon Girin and Dhiren Bhagawati (ed.)*Mao Zedong and Social Construction*, New Delhi: South Asian Publisher
- Mishra K.K. and kalpana M. Iyengar, *Modern Political Theory*: New Delhi: S. Chand & Company

- Sharma S.K. & Urmila Sharma, *Western Political thought (Volume Two)*, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and distributors

Possible Answers to check your progress:

Check your progress - 1

1. Answer: Mao classified contradictions into two kinds – Non-Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved by discussion and negations) and Antagonistic (Differences that can be resolved only by Revolution or War).
2. Answer: Mao's major works were: *On Practice and Contradiction (1937); On Guirella Warfare (1937); Quatations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung (1964); On Contradiction (1967), 'On New Democracy* (1967); *On Protracted War (1967) etc.*
3. For Mao, revolution is an act of violence by which one class overthrows another. This is the central idea of his techniques of revolution. Appeal and compromise have no place in his theory. He was in fact champion of violent revolution.

Check your progress – 2

1. Answer: New Democracy, as propounded by Mao has both political and economic aspects. Economically it means, the following of various principles in the economic spheres. Two important principles related too new democracy were-
   - Regulation of capital
   - Equalization of land ownership.
2. Answer: Mao observed that even after the establishment of Socialist economic Base in China, the superstructures (institutions, organization) failed to respond satisfactorily. Therefore, he and his followers felt the need to change the superstructures to correspond to the base of Chinese society. For Mao, without socialist man motivated by socialist impulse, a socialist system cannot be consolidated. Therefore, he was in support of eliminating the anti-socialist forces and attains ideological goals through Cultural Revolution.

Model questions:

1. Discuss some of the significant political ideas of Mao Zedong.
2. Explain Mao Zedong's view on Revolution.
3. Analyze Mao Zedong's idea of New Democracy.
4. Discuss Mao Zedong's views on contradiction and its forms.
5. What are the significant features of Cultural Revolution, as expounded by Mao Zedong?

Unit-I
M. K. GANDHI

Structure:

1.0. OBJECTIVES:

This unit is concerned with the philosophy of M.K. Gandhi. After going through this unit you will be able to know:

- Essential features of Gandhian Philosophy.
- Gandhi's concept of Politics and Religion
- Gandhi's Philosophy of End and Means
- Concept of Ahimsa in Gandhi's Political Philosophy
- Gandhi's doctrine of Satyagraha
- Concept of Ram Rajya according to Gandhi
- Gandhi's views on Swaraj
- Gandhi's views on Women
- Tenets of Gandhi's Sarvodaya
- Concept of Trusteeship according to Gandhi
- Comparison and contrast between Gandhism and Marxism
- Relevance of Gandhian Concept.

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Dear Learners, in the last Block we discussed Marxist thinkers like Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin and Mao Ze-dong. In this unit you have come to know about different concepts of Marx, Lenin and Mao. They are the supporters of Communist philosophy. More or less these three thinkers are revolutionary

Here in this unit we will discuss Indian Political thinker, M.K. Gandhi. He is regarded as the father of our nation. Gandhi is also known as the Indian Marx. There exists close link between Gandhism and Communism. Gandhism is Communism minus violence.

Though Gandhiji did not want to leave any sect after him, yet he has given to the world certain principles of life and political behaviour which have been given the name of Gandhism. He is associated with different concepts like non-violence, Ahimsa, Satyagraha, Swaraj, Sarvodaya etc.

So in this unit we will throw light on different concepts of M.K. Gandhi. We will also discuss the relevance of Gandhism.

1.2. ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF GANDHIAN PHILOSOPHY

M. K.Gandhi is considered to be the most outstanding personality in the world. He is considered to be one of the most original thinkers. Gandhiji is not a political thinkers or a social theorist in the generally accepted sense of the term like Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes etc. He certainly offers his own ideas on social, economic and political themes which constitute the stock of 'Gandhism'. Gandhiji was also a practical Idealist. He actually did what he said. Gandhi himself stated "I do not claim to have originated any new principal I have tried in my own way to apply the eternal truths to our daily life and problems."

The main them of Gandhian philosophy is his conception of spiritual reality. For Gandhiji spiritual reality is nothing but God. Gandhi believed God as truth. According to Gandhi God is self-existent, all knowing living force which inheres every other force known to the world. He regarded God as supreme reality and supreme good. He advocated the view that God is the ultimate truth. Gandhi himself admitted that to see the universal and all pervading spirit of truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself.Gandhi drew inspiration from all the religions of the world though he was primarily nurtured in the traditions of Hinduism.

Gandhiji admitted that truth is God and there is no other God than truth. According to him truth can be realised in perfect sense through love and Ahimsa.

Gandhi was a practical and logical thinker. He related his theory of Government to his conception of human nature. He had a faith in human nature. He believed in the inner Goodness of man. He was concerned with human nature not only as it was but also as it would be trained and moulded. He gave emphasis on the necessity of moral and spiritual up-liftment of man.

Gandhiji was a moral and spiritual humanist. According to Gandhi service to man is service to God.

Gandhi cannot be identified with any school of western political philosophy like liberalism, socialism, anarchism and communism in spite of the fact that the features of all such theories may be traced in his social and political philosophy. Gandhism can be regarded as philosophical Anarchism in view of the fact that he denounces the nature and character of political authority and wanted to establish an ideal society which is based on freedom, equality and justice by means of Ahimsa and Satyagraha.

The above are the essential features of Gandhism. At last we can say that Gandhiji was a great thinker. He had his ideas on different aspects of the society.

1.3. GANDHI'S CONCEPT OF POLITICS AND RELIGION

Gandhi was not a politician in the Machiavellian sense. Gandhi did not separate religion from politics, but he tried to provide a synthesis of the two. His interest in religion was ethical. He regarded religion in terms of ethical Idealism. Gandhi was a person who had a scientific mind and a spiritual heart. Machiavelli regarded human nature as egoistic. Machiavelli separated morality from politics. But Gandhi's philosophy is against Machiavelli's view. Gandhi tried to base all his social and political doctrines on the religious and spiritual view of human life. According to Gandhi, politics devoid of religion is a death-trap as it kills the soul. He was not the supporter of any religion of the world. Service to the man is his religion. He believed that service to man is like service to God. Gandhi emphasized "I recognize no God except the dumb millions...And I worship the God that is truth, or truth which is God through the service of these millions."

Gandhi's aim was to raise political structure to higher moral entity. He wanted to purify the structure of politics. Gandhi's believed that if religion and politics are intermixed then the criminalization of politics will be minimised.

Learners, Gandhi wished to incorporate moral values in politics. According to Gandhi there are no politics devoid of religion. Gandhi believed that politics is way to serve God. Gandhi said, 'My devotion to truth has drawn me into the field of politics and I can say without the slightest hesitation that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means'. At last, it can be said that Gandhiji spiritualised politics and secularised religion.

1.4. GANDHI'S PHILOSOPHY OF END AND MEANS

Learners, we have discussed essential features of Gandhian philosophy and Gandhi's concept of politics and religion. Now, we shall make an attempt to highlight Gandhi's philosophy of End and Means.

According to Gandhi, the end is the goal and the means is the way of the realization of the goal. Gandhi's philosophy of End and Means has a direct relation with his doctrine of truth and Ahimsa. For him truth is the End and Ahimsa is the Means.

Gandhi held that ends and means are convertible. The so-called Machiavellian code of ethics that 'ends justify the means' had no place in Gandhi's system of thought. Right means must be employed for realisation of right ends. Gandhi linked the means to a seed and the ends to a tree.

According to Gandhi "there is such a close connection between the means and the ends that it is difficult to say which of the two is more important, or we may say that the means is the body and ends is the soul. The end is invisible; the means is visible."

If we adopt right means then we can get right ends, i.e. truth. According to Gandhi End is the ideal and therefore, is not yet within our reach. What we have at our disposal and control is the means. Dear Learner, we can change or adjust or manoeuvre only means not end.

We should realize that Gandhi's philosophy of End and means has its relevance even today to establish a superior democratic social order.

Check your progress-I

1. Was Gandhiji a social theorist?
2. Spiritual reality is the main theme of Gandhian philosophy.
   True/False
3. Was Gandhiji a practical and logical thinker?
   Yes/No
4. Gandhi did not separate religion from politics but tried to provide a synthesis of the two. The statement is correct/ incorrect.

1.5 CONCEPT OF AHIMSA IN GANDHI'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

Dear Learners, we have explained Gandhi's Philosophy of End and Means in the last sub-unit. Now an attempt has been made to discuss Gandhi's concept of Ahimsa.

Concept of Ahimsa occupied a prominent place on Gandhi's political philosophy. 'Ahimsa' literally means non-killing, but for Gandhiji it had a wider meaning and significance. It signified avoiding injury to anything on earth in thought, word or deed. Ahimsa also implies a positive quality of doing good to others instead of merely refraining from doing bad. Its aim is to love the opponent and to win him over by the force of heart. It means goodwill towards all in its active form.

Ahimsa or non-violence is the most active force in the world. Gandhi was influenced by Buddhism and Buddha's ethics of Ahimsa to solve all social, political and economic problems.

Ahimsa or non-violence means doing no injury to the person of others. But Gandhi sanctions the idea of killing a living creature in case there is no way to cure agony and killing is the only way to relieve the creature of that unbearable agony beyond the help of any kind of service. Ahimsa or non-violence is a method of struggle against evil. Gandhi gave importance on Ahimsa or non-violence and Satyagraha for the establishment of ideal state. Gandhi used Ahimsa or non-violence as the strongest weapon to defeat Britishers in the freedom struggle. Indians defeated Britishers not by arms but by Gandhi's technique of Ahimsa or non-violence.

Ahimsa or non-violence is not the weapon of the weak. It is the weapon of the strong.

Gandhi said that there is no other God than truth and the means for the realisation of truth is Ahimsa.

Learners, it can be said that Ahimsa is the most important concept of M.K. Gandhi. The concept of Ahimsa is still relevant today.

1.6. GANDHI'S DOCTRINE OF SATYAGRAHA

Dear learners, we have discussed Gandhi's concept of Ahimsa or non-violence. From the discussion you come to know that Ahimsa is one of the most important principles of life advocated by Gandhi. Now we will discuss his doctrine of Satyagraha.

The idea of satyagraha constitutes the heart and soul of Gandhism. Gandhi used satyagraha as an important technique to create a new social order. Satyagraha is translated into English as "Passive resistance''. Satyagraha is passive only in so far as it espouses self-restraint rather than the active injuring of others. Otherwise, it is an active and assertive policy. Gandhiji said that satyagraha is moral pressure for the sake of truth. According to Gandhi, it is the imperative duty of the satyagrahi to make endless endeavours for the realisation of truth through non-violence. Gandhi termed satyagraha as soul-force. Mahatma Gandhi said that satyagraha is a vindication of truth by bearing witness to it through self- suffering. It is the opposite of coercions and the weapon of the strongest and the bravest.

The main ingredients of the doctrine of satyagraha are

(1) Satyagraha puts emphasis on the operation of soul force against all evils. By applying the technique of satyagraha the heart of the opponent can be won.

(2) Satyagraha is effective both for the killer and killed. It purifies the sufferer, it is also helpful for favourable public opinion.

(3) Satyagraha is the weapon of the strong. Only strong person can practice satyagraha. Satyagraha is not the weapon of the weak.

(4) Satyagraha cannot be identified with the idea of passive resistance. According to Gandhi 'Satyagraha differs from passive resistance as north pole from the south pole. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end, whereas the former has been conceived as the weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form.'

(5) The technique of Satyagraha may take the form of non-cooperation, civil disobedience, Hizrat, Fasting and strike etc.

Non-cooperation was one of the important techniques adopted by Gandhi in freedom struggle. Gandhi started noncooperation movement in 1920 against Britishers. Non-cooperation movement included programmes like surrendering titles and honorary offices which are given by British, refusal to attend Government functions, withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned and controlled by British Government, boycott of British courts, boycott of foreign goods etc.

Civil-disobedience means disobedience of the bad laws of the British Government. Civil-disobedience may be individual as well as mass civil disobedience. According to Gandhi Government has no right to make laws which are against the will and aspiration of the people. Gandhi started civil disobedience movement in 1930 against British rule and broke the Black Salt Laws. Civil disobedience movement became a mass movement in our country.

Another technique of Satyagraha may be voluntary migration or Hizrat.

Fasting is another form of Satyagraha. Gandhi himself adopted this method against British rule. Gandhi believed that fasting can be regarded as a strong

instrument to touch the opponent's heart. Gandhiji mentioned that fasting should be used as the last resort, when all other technique have failed.

Strike or Hartal is also an important form of Satyagraha. Gandhi never advocated for the violent strike or hartal. He only advocated for the peaceful strike or hartal.

Learners, Satyagraha is one of the most important doctrine of M.K. Gandhi. Satyagraha is a weapon through which various social problems can be solved.

1.7 GANDHI'S CONCEPT OF RAM RAJYA

Gandhi wanted to establish a non-violent democratic state where social life would remain self-regulated. He dreamt of a new kind of social order which is based on justice and equality. In Gandhi's ideal state or Ram Rajya there would not be any discrimination between a prince and a pauper, a barrister and a bhangi (Sweeper) and justice would be done even to the dog.

Dear learner, Gandhi used the term 'Swaraj' which is identified with Ram Raj. Gandhi said 'By Ramrajya I donot mean Hinduraj. I mean by Ramrajya divine raj, the kingdom of God. The ancient ideal of Ramrajya is one of true democracy. The state would continue to exist in the society as a non-violent organisation. Gandhi never regarded state as necessary. He considered state as an organisation which is based on violence.

Like the Anarchists Gandhi wanted to establish a stateless society. The state would exist in this society but it would be completely based on non-violence. According to Gandhi only the moral will of the community is sovereign, not the state.

Ram Rajya is a kingdom of love, justice and righteousness. There would be no distinction between big and small work. Everybody in Ram Rajya would be in a happy mood. Ram Rajya represents the rule of the moral spirit. According to Mahatma Gandhi in Ram Rajya there would be no conflict, no tensions and no vested interest. Gandhiji said "There will be no Ram Rajya in the present state of inequality in which a few roll in wealth and the masses even do not have enough to eat. Even distribution will be a feature of this society. It will be characterised by mutual confidence and spontaneous organisation. People will be public, spirited and devoted to the ideals of justice, peace and rights. Non-violence will be the rule of the society. It will aim towards the realization of international peace. There will be no place for war in it."

Gandhiji's concept of Ram Rajya or Ideal Society cannot be realised in reality. Though the picture of Ram Rajya is very attractive, but not a practical one. Gandhi's idea of state as an instrument of exploitation is also not correct.

Check Your Progress – II

1. What does Ahimsa signify according to Gandhi?
2. Write two ingredients of Satyagraha.

1.8 GANDHI'S VIEWS ON SWARAJ

Dear learners we have explained Gandhi's doctrine of Ram Rajya. Here we will throw some light on his views of Swaraj. Actually he identified Swaraj with Ram Rajya.

Swaraj for Gandhi, was the rule of soul force of the individual over the "rule of the brute face" of the state. It literally means self-rule. In the case of Gandhi, the whole meaning of swaraj is tied to the attainment of freedom by means of Ahimsa and Satyagraha. Gandhi also interpreted swaraj as independence within the British Empire if possible and without it if necessary Swaraj is the name of a hypothetical condition of

human life in an ideal society in which everyone has the capacity to resist the abuse of authority.

Gandhi criticized British imperialism because it was responsible for the creation of sufferings to the Indians. Indians suffered a lot under British rule. People of India suffered both politically and economically under British rule. Therefore, Gandhi started freedom struggle to free India from British rule and to establish Swaraj. Gandhi said "The Swaraj of my conception recognises no race or religious distinctions not is it to be the monopoly of lettered persons nor yet of moneyed men. Swaraj is to be for all, including the farmer, but emphatically including the starving, toiling millions.

Gandhi's concept of Swaraj is democratic. Gandhi was also the supporter of individual freedom. He gave emphasis on the freedom of speech, and press. He also supported independence of Judiciary. He was the believer of economic freedom. He stood for equality of wages for all.

We can conclude by saying that Gandhi's concept of Swaraj is a valuable one. It has its importance in 21st century also.

1.9 GANDHI'S VIEWS ON WOMEN

Dear Learner, much have been talked of Gandhi's views on non-violence, Satyagraha and Ram Rajya etc. Equally important are Gandhi's views on women. Gandhi was the supporter of gender equality and empowerment of women. Gandhi noticed that women were greatly honoured in ancient Vedic periods. Women occupied a much higher position in ancient India. But now status of women has been declined. Female infanticide, foeticide, child marriage, dowry, sati, Purdah system, molestation, trafficking etc. are some of the evils which are present in our society. Gandhi seems to be very critical of these evil practices against women.

In our society birth of a girl child is not welcomed. Dowry is considered to be a reason for which the girl child is considered rather a liability for her parents. Gandhi asked to rejoice at the birth of a boy as well as girl. Gandhi appealed all the people of India to respect womenfolk from inmost corner of the heart.

Gandhi criticised dowry system as a pernicious system which lower the status of women, destroy their sense of equality with men and pollute the institution of marriage.

Gandhi suggested the change in education, some radical measures like organizing movement and offering Satyagraha against those perpetuating such custom. Gandhi stated that child marriage is a moral and physical evil which affects the progress of women. Gandhi also concerned for the pathetic lives of Indian widows. Gandhi advised for the remarriage of child widows. Gandhi also criticised Purdah system. According to Gandhi the Purdah weaken instead of strengthening morality for it does not help in preserving chastity which is not a hot-house growth and cannot be superimposed.

Gandhi appealed women to fight against vicious sanctions and kind of exploitation over them. Gandhi stated that women are not weak , women can also shape their destiny as men.

Gandhi supported education for women. Gandhi viewed that women were neither mere toys in the hands of men, nor their competitors. Instead of thinking of women as weaker sex, Gandhi spoke of them as embodiment of virtues like knowledge, tolerance, sacrifice and faith.

Economic empowerment of women is another important issue on which Gandhi gave his opinion. He stood in favour of the women taking up some work to

supplement the earning of the family. He also recommended equal pay for both men and women for same work.

It can be said that he was not only a political thinker but also a reformer of the society. His views on gender equality are highly relevant today.

1.10 Tenets of Gandhi's Sarvodaya

Learners, from our last discussion you have come to know about Gandhi's views on women. Now we will highlight some points on his philosophy of Sarvodaya. You know that it is one of the most important philosophy of Gandhi.

Gandhian idea of sarvodaya is the apex of Gandhian socialism. Sarvodaya means "the uplift of all." It is a principle of a new philosophical, social, ethical, economic and political order whose aim, in the words of Gandhiji's spiritual disciple, Vinoba Bhave, is that "all may be happy." Sarvodaya is not a philosophy that regards the maximization of material well being as man's only measure of social progress. Sarvodaya aims at the spiritualization of politics. Gandhi's Sarvodaya stands for the all round well being of all. Sarvodaya reiterates belief in God and, what is really important is that it accepts Gandhi's ethical principle and lays greater emphasis on their social and positive aspects. Sarvodaya also gives importance on the abolition of private ownerships, sarvodaya pleads for villagisation, decentralization. Man should be deprived of his right to property in the social interest by means of non-violence and Satyagraha so that there is a real change of heart. Through this way he showed the path for the emancipation of whole community.

There are some basic ideals of the Sarvodaya. The following are the basic ideals of the Sarvodaya movement.

A Stateless Society – Acharya Vinoba Bhave, the chief exponent of Sarvodaya advocated for the establishment of a society in which people are free from expectation and oppression. Sarvodaya is against the state of its present form. The ideal of Sarvodaya is a stateless society free from every type of authority, though it will take some time for its establishment.

Against representative democracy and party system –

The exponents of sarvodaya are opposed to democracy as a form of government as prevailing in countries like Britain, U.S.A. and India as they are based on party system. Gandhi considered political party system is an evil, as it breaks people into groups, compels them to conspire against one another and give rise to the tyranny of majority.

Loose federation of autonomous villages –

In the Saravodaya Society, there will be a loose federation of autonomous villages in each of which there is almost self-sufficiency. The features of the sarvodaya society can be mentioned as (1) There is no centralised authority and there is no political and economic autonomy in the villages. (2) Politics will not be the instrument of power, but an agency of service. (3) Society will be functioning on the basis of non-violence. (4) There will be no party system, (5) The Sarvodaya society is socialist in the true sense of the term. (6) Sarvodaya society should be based on equality and liberty.

At last it can be said that sarvodaya is a powerful intellectual attempt to build a plan of political and social reconstruction on the basis of metaphysical idealism. Though we cannot totally accept the formulas of sarvodaya yet it is a theory which can make people happy.

1.11 CONCEPT OF TRUSTEESHIP

Learners we have discussed Gandhi's sarvodaya philosophy. Now we will discuss Gandhi's concept of Trusteeship.

According to Gandhi, trusteeship is a system which desires that property should be under the control of a private person, but he should regard himself as its protector not its master. It is based on the ideal of non-possession as given in the Isopanishada. According to his concept of Trusteeship one should have as much as would satisfy one's hunger.

The theory of trusteeship has some implication.

Trusteeship applies with regard to accumulated wealth and earnings beyond one's needs. One should have as much as wealth and earnings as ones need. Excess wealth earnings should be held in trust.

Trusteeship implies equality of rights, not of rewards. Gandhi made an appeal to the intellectuals to make use of their talent in the interest of the community.

Gandhi was not the supporter of nationalisation. He was the supporter of private property. So individual can become the owner of property. But property owners should consider themselves as the custodian of social wealth.

Gandhiji was not in favour of law of inheritance.

So from the above it can be said that Gandhi wanted to establish a equalitarian society. Gandhi advocates for the legislative regulation of the ownership of wealth. Under the trusteeship system the character of production would be determined by social necessity not by personal greed.

But learners, Gandhi's concept of Trusteeship cannot be accepted in full form. Critics criticised it as an utopian concept.

1.12 COMPARISON AND CONTRAST BETWEEN GANDHISM AND MARXISM

There is a great similarity between M.K. Gandhi and Karl Marx. Both of them aimed at to establish stateless and classless society. But they adopted different means. Gandhi wanted to achieve this end through non-violent means but Marx wanted to achieve it through violent means.

Though both Mahatma Gandhi and Karl Marx were opposed to capitalism but they adopted different methods to remove capitalism. Gandhi was the supporter of economic decentralisation. He also encouraged cottage industries. Karl Marx wanted to remove capitalism by violent means.

M.K. Gandhi was a Spiritualist, but Karl Marx was a Materialist. So there exists dissimilarity between them.

Gandhi was not in favour of using violent means for achieving a good end. He adopted only non-violent means for the achievement of India's freedom. Karl Marx believed in violent means to establish classless society.

M.K. Gandhi allowed the investment of private capital but not exploitation through it. He wanted to make the capitalist trustees of the national wealth. He also wanted to provide powers to the state to control the industries. But Marx was totally against private property.

M.K. Gandhi believed in democratic principle. He was the supporter of decentralisation of powers. But Marx believed in the Dictatorship of the proletariat. He wanted to give maximum powers to the workers.

Gandhi was not the supporter of class war but Marx preferred class struggle.

So there exist both similarities and dissimilarities between Gandhism and Marxism.

1.13 Relevance of Gandhi's Philosophy

Gandhian ideas of Truth, Ahimsa, Non-Violence, Satyagraha, universal brotherhood, decentralized democracy etc. appear to be relevant forever. Gandhi's views on the use of non-violence in solving problems are relevant because so far violence has solved no problem. His views that state should least governed is accepted by many states of today. Gandhi wanted to give autonomy to villages to establish Ram Rajya has been accepted by the government of India through decentralized planning and village autonomy. Gandhi's concept of politics and religion is practically accepted by not divorcing politics from religion. The nations of the world today in the era of LPG realised that nationalism and internationalism should go hand in hand.

From this, we can say that Gandhian Philosophy has great relevance even today and if we follow and practice seriously the Gandhian ideals in the true sense, that will help us in solving many of our problems in today's society and here lies the relevance of Gandhian philosophy.

Check Your Progress –III

1. Gandhiji identified swaraj with Ram Rajya. The statement is true/false.
2. Gandhi was against women education. The statement is true/false.
3. Gandhiji's idea of Sarvodaya is the apex of Gandhian socialism. The statement is true/false.
4. Mention two basic ideas of sarvodaya.
5. "Trusteeship implies equality of rights not of rewards." – Gandhiji. Is the statement correct?
6. Gandhi was a .... but Karl Marx was a .... (Fill up the gaps)

1.14 Let Us Sum Up

In this unit we have dealt with Gandhi's view points on different aspects like-essential features of Gandhian philosophy of End and Means, his concept of Ahimsa, doctrine of satyagraha, concept of Ram Rajya, his views on swaraj, women, Trusteeship and also a comparison and contrast between Gandhism and Marxism . The unit is concluded with a brief discussion on relevance of Gandhian philosophy today.

The unit certainly provides you knowledge on the various features of Gandhian philosophy. This will also help you to know the basic philosophy and their applicability in the society. In reality, you will also come to know that Gandhi's philosophy is far from translation into reality. But it does not mean that Gandhi's philosophy has no relevance today.

1.15 Key Words

TRUTH

Truth is the highest ideal for Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi was guided by the principle of Truth. Gandhi said that there is nothing higher than truth.

Truth means satya which is derived from the word 'Sat' means 'is' or 'being'. Truth is the only thing which is or exists in reality. According to Gandhi God is Truth.

NON-VIOLENCE

Non-Violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. Non-Violence or Ahimsa implies avoiding injury to anything on earth in thought, word or deed. It

also implies a positive quality of doing good to others instead of merely refraining from doing bad. Non-violence is the most active force in the world.

SATYAGRAHA

Satyagraha is composed of two Sanskrit nouns satya Meaning ‘truth’ and agraha, meaning ‘firm grasping’. Satyagraha means devotion to truth. Satyagraha implies steadily towards the discovery of the absolute truth. Gandhi strongly believed in the principle of Satyagraha. He explained ‘The world rests upon the bedrock of satya or truth; asatya meaning untruth also means “nonexistent” and satya or truth, means that which is untruth does not so much exist. Its victory is out of the question. And truth being “that which is” can never be destroyed.

1.16 SUGGESTED READINGS:

1. Choudhury, M. Exploring Gandhiji, The Gandhi and Foundation, New Delhi, 1987.
2. Easwarna, E, Gandhi The Man, Petaluma, C.A, Nilgiri Press, 1978.
3. Copley, A, Gandhi against the Tide, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1999.
4. Sharma, M.L, (ed), The selected works of Mahatma Gandhi, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad 1968.
5. Vepa, Ram K, New Technology, A Gandhian Concept, Gandhi Book House, New Delhi, 1975.
6. Kripalani K, (ed), M.K. Gandhi, All Men Are Brothers, Autobiographical Reflections, The continuum Publishing company, New York, 1990.
7. Kripalani, J.B. Gandhi, His life and Thought, publication Division, New Delhi, 2005
8. Agarwal, S.N. Gandhian constitution for free India, Kitabistan, Allahabad, 1964.

Possible answers to Check your progress:

Check your progress-I

1. Gandhi was not a social theorist in generally accepted sense.
2. True
3. Yes
4. Correct

Check your progress - II

1. According to Gandhi Ahimsa signifies avoiding injury to anything on earth in thought, word on deed. It also implies a positive quality of doing good to others instead of merely refraining from doing bad.
2. (i) Satyagraha puts emphasis on the operation of soul force against all evils.
   (ii) Satyagraha is affection both for the killer and killed. It purifies the sufferer. It is also helpful favourable brief option.

Check your progress – III

1. Gandhi identified Swaraj with Ram Rajya. The statement is true
2. False.
3. True
4. (i) Stateless society
   (ii) Against representative democracy and party system.
5. Yes, the statement “Trusteeship implies equality of rights not of rewards”- is correct.
6. Gandhiji was a spiritualist but Karl Marx was a materialist.

References

1. Johari, J.C., Principles of modern Political Science, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1989.
2. Agarwal, R.C. Political Theory, S. Chand & Company LTD. New Delhi, 1994.
3. Easwarna, E, Gandhi The Man, Petaluma, CA, Nilgiri Press, 1978
4. Bakshi, S.R., Gandhi and his Social Thought, Criterion Publication at New Delhi, 1986.
5. Choudhury, M, Exploring Gandhi. Gandhi peace Foundation, New Delhi 1989.
6. Gandhi, M.K., Social Service, work and Reform, Narjivan Publishing House, Ahemdabad, 1976

MODEL QUESTION

1. Discuss essential features of Gandhian philosophy.
2. "Gandhiji spiritualised politics and secularised religion." - Discuss.
3. Analyse Gandhi's philosophy of end and means.
4. Bring out the philosophy underlying Gandhiji's doctrine of Satyagraha.
5. State and examine Gandhi's views on swaraj'.
6. Describe briefly the Gandhian concept of Ram Rajya. How for it is a practical idea?
7. Analyse Gandhi's concept of sarvodaya.
8. Discuss the relevance of Gandhian philosophy in modern times.

Unit – II

Manabendra Nath Roy

Structure:

2.0 OBJECTIVES

By the end of this unit you should be able to:

1. Know about life sketch of M. N. Roy,
2. Illustrate his political ideas,
3. Explain the meaning of radical humanism,
4. Describe the meaning of new humanism,
5. Explain the criticism on new humanism,
6. Analyse his criticism on Gandhian political thought.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit we have learned about the political philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi. As we have learned that Gandhi's political philosophies have widely accepted in the political discourses and many of them have wider global acceptance. His ideas are the back born of India's grassroots democracy. But Gandhi's ideas are mainly liberal in outlook and hence many of his philosophies have invited wide criticism. Among the other critiques M.N. Roy has been the most ardent critique of Gandhi. In this unit therefore we would learn about the growth of renaissance in India and the role played by M. N. Roy in enhancing the political theory. It was assumed that among the other modern Indian political thinkers Roy was the most influential as he was more a philosopher than a mass leader. His ideas made a serious departure from his contemporary thinkers as he was essentially among the greatest thinkers of the twentieth century and truly a citizen of the world. His ideas have both national as well as international repute. It is seen that his entire ideas roams mostly around the freedom of human being at both national and international level. He was quite determined to foster on the unity of individuals as it would for him will unite all those who stand for peace and human values to fight for human freedom. His ideas are therefore very much radical in its outlook. Hence, once Lenin described him as – 'the symbol of revolution in the east'. In the next part of this unit we would discuss more on the life sketch of M. N. Roy and his political ideas.

2.2 BRIEF LIKE SKETCH OF M. N. ROY

Let us now know about a brief life sketch on M. N. Roy. M. N. Roy was born in a Brahmin family in West Bengal on 21st March, 1887. His family was hereditarily priests. Born in a Brahmin family he had got a complete transformation into a radical human being in his last few years of life. Since, from his teens he had joined Bengal Revolutionary Movement. He was influenced by the political revolutionary ideas of B. C. Pal, Aurobindo Ghosh and Surendra Nath Banerjee. It was in 1914 he was involved into direct revolutionary terrorist activities. His involvement in the direct revolution was mainly moulded by his association with Jatin Mukherjee and the active Leadership and members of 'Yugantara Group'. He was bestowed the responsibility to receive the German steamer who was carrying arms for revolutionary terrorists. But, that mission did not succeed. Then, he was also trying to procure arms from China which was also turned into a failure. With the constant failure he escaped to America where he got an opportunity to learn socialist ideas. However, because of his inclination into revolution he had quite inducted into the philosophy of Karl Marx, this had also facilitated him to come into a close contact with some of the greatest Marxists his contemporary time. It was also recorded that he was among the founders of the Communist Party in Mexico in 1918. He also remained a member of the presidium and secretariat of the Communist International and was also acted as a chief advisor of the Communist Party of China for quite a sometime. His involvement in the Communist

Party of Mexico he also got an opportunity to participate in the Second Congress of the Communist International. In 1926 he led a delegation to China as a representative of Communist International. Slowly he had developed serious differences with the Communist International leadership and he was also dismembered from the Commintern in 1929 and he had come back to India in 1930. After returning to India he was whole heartedly involving in the Nationalist Movement for a decade i.e. from 1930 to 1940. Then he formed a political party named as Radical Democratic Party to unite peasants, workers and petty bourgeoisie of India. But that did not last long and by 1948, the party was dismantled and he had started with a new movement known as Radical or New Humanism. Hence his journey of life travels from revolutionary terrorism to radical humanism. He died on 26th January, 1954.

He was one of the most learned thinkers of Modern India. Apart from his active revolutionary activities he was also contributed in the academics. Some of the major works of him are: India in Transition (1922), What do you want? (1922), Indian Problems and Its Solution (1922), One Year of Non – Cooperation from Ahmadabad to Gaya (1923), The Future of Indian Politics (1926), Revolution and Counter – Revolution in China (1946), Materialism: An Outline of the History of Scientific Thought (1940), A New Orientation: Statement on the International Situation (1946), Beyond Communism to Humanism (1947), Radical Humanism (1952). All these books are prominent in academics.

2.3 HIS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

The political philosophy of M. N. Roy has been mainly stressed on Marxism and the aftermath. His political philosophies have been developed through three phases. The first phase lasts up to 1919, where he played a vital role for the terrorist movement in Bengal. In the second phase he has become an active Marxist and actively participated in the Communist movement in Mexico, Russia, China and finally India. In the last phase he emerged as a Radical Humanist where he abandoned Marxism for liberal humanism. His political philosophies were the product of his attachment and detachment for two different poles of political philosophies. At the beginning he was drawn closer to the Marxian school of thought and the later, once he came back from the west, he drawn more closely inclined towards humanism, more precisely to radical humanism. Having said that he was also not an ardent Marxist like Lenin or Stalin was. Moreover he was also critical regarding Indian Spiritualism. His political philosophies also reflect his resentment towards political ideas of M. K. Gandhi and his Congress. In the latter part of his life his political philosophies were mostly critical regarding Marxism. Rather his ideas were mainly inclined towards liberal humanism which emphasised on Universal brotherhood and decentralization of political and economic power. Therefore, his political philosophies are multifaceted; ranging, from revolutionary nationalism to internationalism, from Marxism to humanism, from Centralization to decentralisation. Therefore in the next unit we will discuss about the transition from Marxism to Radical Humanism.

2.3.1 FROM MARXISM TO RADICAL HUMANISM

During the beginning of his political career M. N. Roy was impressed by the philosophy of Karl Marx. Marx impressed him because Marx was a passionate humanist. As a humanist Marx always supported the freedom of man. He has faith on the creativity of man and hence emphasised on revolution. Roy considered Marxism as more than a mere political and economic approach rather as revolution. He opined that Marxism as an approach related to the idea of humanity, as ideological equipment it

has mainly aimed at a better world. Marx's impassionate moral plea for Social Justice also attracted him towards Marx. Having influenced by Marxian philosophy it was a fact that, Roy was not a blind follower of Marxism. He did not every point of time use Marxist methodology. Rather he noticed several disagreements with the versions of Marxism as developed by the predecessors of Marx in the later period of time which compels him to leave the Marxist Communist movement. The major reason for such detachment with Marxism is his breach with Communist International in the late twenties. Stalin's denial towards moral values of progressive force and involvement in military expansionism to establish supremacy was another reason what dissatisfied Roy. However, the teachings of Marx were also abandoned by him and substantial changes were introduced. Roy was very much critical of the Marx's concepts of history, the dialectics, the concept of surplus value and the complete marginalization of the individual. These changes were incorporated by him in his ideas of humanism i.e. Radical and New Humanism. Let us now discuss about his concept of Radical Humanism.

2.3.2 HIS CONCEPT OF RADICAL HUMANISM

The idea of Humanism is rational as it tends to recognise the importance of Man and individual liberty. It is a concept by which an individual has set free from the undesired subordination of another man with super natural capacities. Man therefore is the centre of humanist tradition. The prime object of radical humanism hence is to ensure the freedom of the individuals. The idea why he used radical before humanism is the realisation that individual liberty was almost missing in the 19^{th} century liberalism. He hence aimed to revive liberty of individual. He presumed that greater the rationalism of the individuals composing a society, the larger would be the measure of freedom enjoyed by them. The object of radical humanist was to organized the society in a rational manner. For him, State and Society were created to protect the Liberty of man. But there were certain obstacles in front of them which hinder the human development and freedom. For example, marriage, family, religion, class etc. were some obstacles to individual freedom.

To begin with, Roy was a Marxist. About Marxism he remarks, "Marxism is the outcome of the development of thought from dawn of history, therefore it is the heritage of humanity, it is the ideological equipment belonging to everybody for 'a better world'. Therefore, at the beginning his concept of Radical Humanism has been mainly inclined towards Marxism. However, he did not have dogmatic approach to Marxism. Hence he could not remain a Marxist for long. This transition from Marxism to radicalism took place from 1940 to 1947. In July, 1929, he was turned out of the Commintern. Since then he deviated from orthodox Marxisian line. In 1940, he organised Radical Democratic Party sponsored a new orientation towards the scientific politics. He began a journey away from Marxism towards radicalism." In evolving radical humanism, he was influenced by *18^{th} Century Rationalists viz.* Marx, Feverback, Lenin, Hobbes and Hageland. He strove to interweave these different streams of ideas into one philosophical system. He defines radical humanism as a – "Philosophy of freedom based on modern, scientific knowledge." He opined that, due to the errors and inadequacies of previous ideologies, contemporary life stood degraded and demoralised. Hence, he expressed the need of new truly revolutionary, social and political philosophy capable of infusing and re-invigorating ethical outlook in the man.

Hence, he started opposing Karl Marx and his philosophy on specific grounds which are as follows:

➢ Firstly, Roy did not consider Surplus Value as an important characteristic of capitalism as believed by Marx. Because Roy believed that, no society could progress and there could not be possibility of capital formation, unless there was a surplus of production over consumption and unless this surplus was utilised as capital for supplementing production further. He understood that the capitalist society was more progressive then a feudal society because it involves in the creation of surplus value. Hence, he concluded that surplus value was also needed in a socialist state.

➢ Secondly, he did not accept the Marxian interpretation of history as it inadequately allows the mental activity to play a role in the historical progress. Marx had held history as a dialectical process governed by the forces of production and distribution. He was of the view the class and revolution constitutes the instruments of historical change and its conditions are generated by contradiction between the forces of production and relations of productions. At each stage of historical evolution, culture, religion, art, philosophy, laws, etc., are build by the condition of economic sub-structures. Hence, Roy discards such approach emphatically and considers theory of evolution expounded by Marx as cynical. History is the story of man's quest for freedom and hence it becomes comparative and collective process. He described it as an 'organic' evolutionary process. He did not accept that economic forces alone can change the stages of history.

There were numbers of factors caused the historical movements and result in historical events. Roy was not agreed to accept only the economic factor as the most important factor even. He said, "Philosophically, the materialist conception of history must recognise the creative role of intelligence, Materialism and cannot deny the objective reality of ideas".

He also opined that biology not economics dictated the early activities of mankind. The early activities of human beings were directed and motivated by biological desires. Even in the later part of the history of mankind, man finds satisfaction in diverse type of activities which cannot be conceal under the courses of economics. He further argued that, cultural and ideological factors play vital role in historical causation. For example, a study of the economic conditions of the early middle ages reflected that there was no casual connection between the rise of the trading class and the renaissance. The Renaissance was a phrase in man's age old struggle for freedom. It was a chapter in the cultural history of mankind which was inspired by the humanist, rationalistic and scientific ideas of ancient Greek Civilization than by the economic ideas or political ambitions to the mediaeval trading class. He also maintained that once ideas emerged, they acquire their own autonomy. With ideas man made history and transform their social and economic environments. In the words of Roy, "history therefore does not follow the Marxian pattern of dialectics but is a movement from homogenous massed to the evolution of distinct individualities, experimenting in various forms of harmonisation between themselves." Roy felt that individuals create history and not the economic ideas which shape classes in History as held by Marx.

However, influence of Marx did not disappear completely from his mind altogether. Like Marx, he holds that cultural and ideological ideas appear unestablished order of thing. When the established order impedes the forces of freedom and progress, change is called for. Since the order does not undergo a change, revolution breaks out to change it. To begin with, the gifted and inspired minority adopts revolutionary method and then the masses come under its impact, eventually leading to a revolution.

➢ Thirdly, he regarded the ethical foundations of Marxism as weak as they were dogmatic and their religious basis was indefensible. The subordination of man to the irresistible dominance of forces of production counterbalanced the autonomy and creativity of Individuals. Roy's humanist ethics acclaimed sovereignty of man and believed in the value based hierarchy of freedom and justice. Thus in place of the Marxist thesis which interprets ethical norms in terms of class struggles, Roy accepts that there is something permanent in ethnical values, it is mainly situational.

➢ Fourthly, Roy denounces Marxism for its rejection of the liberal concept of individualism. He emphasised that rejection of the liberal and utilitarian concept of the individual amounted to betrayal of Marx's early humanism. He opined that, Marx had done so, under the influence of the Hegelian thesis of moral positivism which standardised class as norms of the society. Thus minimising the role of the individual.

➢ Fifthly, Roy did not accept Marxian philosophy of class struggle. He opined that history speaks of other social classes also, besides the two classes referred by Marx. Unlike Marx he believed that, history of man is not always the history of class struggle. Besides tension and struggle, a social cohesive bond also had been operative. Moreover, he argued that, the Contemporary Society had not been bifurcated into antithetical polarised sector as envisaged by Karl Marx in his 'Communist Manifesto'. It further created doubts in the mind of Roy regarding Marxian thesis.

➢ Sixthly, Roy also vehemently criticised Marx for his intentional overlook on the Importance of Middle Class. He described Marx as a false prophet who predicted disappearance of the middle class. He cited examples where there was increase in the number of middle class due to the expansion of the economic process. The middle class doubts in Post – 1919 world history. It produced revolutionaries.

➢ Seventhly, he criticised Marxian emphasis on revolution and opined that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the concept of revolution are apt to lead to totalitarianism. Revolutions in his opinion could not bring miracles. However, he did not discard revolution altogether. As a radical humanist, he believed that a revolution should be brought about not through class struggle or armed violence but through education which included all modes of persuasion of the masses. He contends that there is an element of voluntaristic romanticism in revolutions. Revolution represents collective emotions heightened to a pitch and in fact exaltation of human efforts to remake the world. The violent practices of Soviet Communism based on Karl Marxism portray a different picture of revolution. In fact they reveal cult of collective irrationalism. Moreover, Marxian materialistic determinism and revolutionary teleology are not reconcilable. Marx strove the combine the belief in history and cosmos as a determined process with the advocacy of theological concept of the freedom of revolutionary will an action in transforming the texture of that process.

➢ Lastly, he denounced the theory of Dictatorship of Proletariat. In fact he laid emphasis on the individual more than the class whether it would be the working class or the middle class. He opined that conflict of the present age was between totalitarianism and democracy, between all devouring collective ego – nation or class and the individual struggling for freedom. He in fact gives a pride of place to the middle – class rather than the Proletariat.

In fact, Roy is critical of Marxian philosophy and the sociology of 'historical materialism', though he had not gone deep into the technicalities of Marxian economics. It appears as if he was not acquainted with some of the fundamental theories of Marx, i.e. accumulation of capital, capitalist reproduction and theory of Labour Value as propounded in Volumes I and III of Marx's Capital. Keeping in view

of the flaws of Marxism he remarked, "We must look beyond the deceptive ideal of communism if the threatened catastrophe is to be avoided. We must have faith in human ingenuity and the creativeness of human mind which are far from being exhausted."

2.3.3 CRITICISM OF RADICAL HUMANISM

His idea of Radical Humanism is also not free from criticism. The major criticisms of this concept are as follows:

- Firstly, the belief that Roy made on all the living bodies originated out of the matter is not free from criticism. He had even stressed that even the mind is also the product of matter. But, Roy did not give rational and adequate justifications how the living bodies are emerged out of matter. Moreover Roy also developed his theory on the presumption that man is essentially a rational being and man decided everything by reason. But, unfortunately Roy had failed to explain the term 'reason' clearly.
- Secondly, Roy also condemned religion as an obstacle in the development of freedom. But his opinion about religion is proved to be wrong. Practically, religion plays a very significant role in the cultural and intellectual development of our society. Moreover, Religion is a part of human life and It is quite undesirable to condemn the institution of religion, which plays a very important role in human life. Therefore, one may criticise Roy for developing a negative perspective on religion.
- Thirdly, Roy was also criticised for his presumption that physical and social beings are governed by the same laws but such an analogy is not correct. M. N. Roy's concept of Individual freedom is also misleading.
- Next, critics also criticised Roy for his demand for social reconstruction. To quote Dr. Goyal, *"A political philosophy or a scheme of social reconstruction is useless it provides the concrete contents of individual freedom. Roy regarded the institution of marriage and family as obstacles in the development of freedom. But who can deny that marriage and family satisfy the sex and parental instincts? So it is undesirable to denounce the institution of marriage and family."* From this definition it is seen that by adopting Radical Humanism Roy has intentionally overlook the necessity of social institutions, which fosters not hinders individual freedom.
- At last his criticism of Marxian philosophy is also a point of criticism. Roy has unnecessarily questioned Marx and his philosophy in reference to individual and individual freedom. The fact is although Roy criticised Marxian thoughts, but the basis of his political thoughts are also dependent to Marx and his philosophy.

Check Your Progress – 1

1. Mention three books wrote by M.N. Roy
2. What political tradition M. N. Roy was influenced by at the early stage of his career?
3. What do you understand by Radical Humanism by Roy?
4. Mentioned three disagreement of Roy with Marx while defining Radical Humanism.
5. Mention two major criticisms of M.N. Roy's Radical Humanism.

2.4 HIS CONCEPT OF NEW HUMANISM

In the previous section we have already discussed about Radical Humanism, now in this section we will learn about New Humanism and its critique. Roy political philosophies did not confined only into radical humanism. Rather there was a change from Radicalism to integral scientific humanism or New Humanism from the year 1947 to 1954. In a Manifesto published in August, 1947, Roy expounded his political views which were founded on reason and morality devoid of any dogma. The humanism of European renaissance which was enriched by the discoveries of present day sciences the basis for a new social order had deep impact in the thoughts of Roy. Hence, one may rightly contended that Roy's humanistic elements of thoughts are perceptible to several schools and epochs of western philosophy. He craves for New Humanism based upon natural reason and secular conscience. To him, rationalist humanistic ethics appears here forth to be the panacea of all human ills. As such, the very method to achieve the end is to be ethical.

Hence, the political method adopted by him emphasises the adoption of right means for the attainment of just end. He said, "It is very doubtful that a moral object can ever be attained by immoral means". This has made Roy close to Gandhi's way of thinking. But, this is not to say that, the social order visualised by Roy was similar to Gandhi's Ram Rajya. Unlike Gandhi, he did not derive the inspiration for a reformed social order from Indian Institutions. Rather it is the European traditions of liberalism and humanism which influenced his mind. He pleaded for the application to the physical sciences and for the adoption of the humanist approach of the 19th Century radicals.

His humanist conception was mainly cosmopolitan in nature. Individual not the nation or class is in priority for him while developing his concept of humanism as cosmopolitanism. Such a conception was the foundation of New Humanism. It is conceived as New because for him this version of humanism is enriched, reinforced, elaborated by scientific knowledge and social experience gained during the centuries of modern civilization. Such a humanistic society as conceived by Roy was not limited by the boundaries of nation or state. He wrote, "New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A Cosmopolitan commonwealth of spiritually free men would not be limited by the boundaries of national states, which will gradually disappear under the impact of the 20th century renaissance of man."

He also made a distinction between internationalism and cosmopolitanism. He pleaded for a spiritual community or cosmopolitan humanism. Internationalism assumed the existence of separate national states. Roy was of the view that a true world government can be established after the neutralisation of nation's states. Further, as referred already, in bringing radical humanist revolution he advocated on the method of education. This method did not differ much from the constitutional methods adopted by the early moderates and liberals among the Indians, like Dadabhai Naoroji, M. G. Ranade, S. N. Banerjee and G. K. Gokhale.

However this shift has been quite strange as Roy who started his political life as a militant nationalist and embraced the Marxian doctrine of revolution, suddenly turned into gradual and constitutional method of the moderates and the liberals. After his inclination to liberalism he described the latter half of the 19th Century as the age of Indian History. The liberals flourished during this golden period. Roy seems to be conscious of humanity passing through a period of crisis. Hence, he opined that the fundamental problem of the time was to secure individual freedom against the infringement of the totalitarianism of the Society. The economic problems of capital

versus labour were no longer the prime issue, though it demands solution in the interest of suppressed humanity. New Humanism reasserts the sovereignty of man by holding that history is the record of man's activities and society has no business to thrust itself as a Leviathan on man.

New humanism as conceived by Roy is to re-stress on the spiritual freedom and accept the worth of moral and spiritual freedom and reason. In integral humanism there are three instincts that influence individual – freedom, reason and morality. These three are not speculative, but are crystallisations of the experiences gained in historical evolution.

Unlike that of Aurobindo, who regards liberty as a divinely planted instinct in man, Roy traces the root of freedom to the Hobbesian – Darwinian concept of struggle for existence and self preservation. In the words of Roy, "the quest for freedom is the continuation of the biological struggle for existence at the emotional and cognitional levels. Hence he describes freedom as a fundamental progress. It is latent in man. Its realisation depends upon the traditional ecclesiasticism and unfounded supernaturalism." Freedom, to Roy, embodied the core of the biological struggle for self-preservation and multiplication of the human being's in a somewhat hostile nature. Human being has the capacity to get rid of restrictions imposed by the nature. Therefore, the notion of freedom, argues Roy, consists of the inalienable elements of humanism, individualism and rationalism.

He asserted that spiritual freedom is pre-requisite for social and political emancipation of an individual. Spiritual liberation would fill confidence in individual as regards to his potentialities and would encourage him, to participate in the collective human endeavour to build a force society. Such way of thinking makes him closer to Robert Owen and S. T. Simon and Karl Grun – a German socialist who considered mental enlightenment as the preface to a social reconstruction.

Further, Roy emphasised that the vital pre – requisite for a political and social reconstruction resides in the intellectual renaissance of man and which generated the fundamental essence of the philosophy of New Humanism. In Roy's words, "A brotherhood of men attracted by the adventure of ideas, keenly conscious of the urge for freedom fired with the vision of a free society of free man and motivated by the will to remake the world so as to restore the individual in his position of primacy and dignity will how the way out of the contemporary crisis of modern civilization."

Roy is of the view that, whole scheme of New Humanism would be operationalized only if the citizens of the nations are adequately educated in rational thinking. He believes that, rationality can only possible through proper education. Education for him although, slow but certain emancipator of the people from the epoch of irrational system of life. Therefore, he denounced the idea of violent and quick class struggle or revolution to establish the virtues of rationality, morality and freedom which are three important aspects of New Humanism and he relied on enlightenment in the minds of people regarding the above mentioned three aspects of life through education.

2.4.1 CRITICISM OF NEW HUMANISM

The concept of New Humanism by Roy is not free from criticism. These can be summarised as under:

1. The idea of New Humanism was propagated by Roy to show his dissatisfaction on the ideological and theoretical background of the Marxian thought. Therefore, many of the characteristics of New Humanism are by nature stand antagonistic to the conception of Marxian

analysis and mainly rooted in reason, morality and freedom of the individual. But, this was criticised by many critics that the idea of new humanism developed by him was not actually of his own rather these were mere extended illustration of what Marx and his successors made on class antagonism and revolution. Therefore critics are of the view that, Roy's New Humanism has been an outcome of his inclination towards Marxian thought.

2. Another important criticism of New Humanism is that, Roy's idea of New Humanism is not feasible for a nation like India, by considering the prevailing socio – economic and political circumstances in the country. For example, it is noticed that while realising the idea of New Humanism Roy has been constantly pressurising for abolishing the political parties and the conduct of political activities in the country, to pave the way for humanist politics. But, for critics, this phenomenon is theoretically sounds interesting but lack practical relevance. Because, practically without political party one cannot assume to run a democratic system. In the next section we will learn about the M. N. Roy's critique of Gandhian thought.

Check Your Progress – 2

1. Do you think that the idea of New Humanism is separate from Radical Humanism?
2. Fill in blank with appropriate words:
a. The Major foundation of New Humanism is ___________________________ .
b. The European Philosophy of liberalism and ______________________ influenced M. N. Roy while discussing about New Humanism.
3. What are three instincts of man integral to humanism?
4. What is the fundamental essence of the philosophy of New Humanism?

2.5 M. N. ROY'S CRITIQUE OF GANDHIAN THOUGHT

M. N. Roy among the other Marxist political thinkers provided most well argued and comprehensive criticism of Mahatma Gandhi's socio political ideas. But, he was not critical to the ideas of Gandhi since beginning of his carrier. It was found that Roy pays a glowing tribute to the socio – political thoughts of Gandhi at the beginning. Furthermore, he did compare the thoughts of Gandhi that too with St. Thomas Aquinas and Savonarola. In his book – "One Year of Non-cooperation" he praised Gandhi for four constructive contribution i.e. Use of Mass action for political purposes; consolidation of Indian National Congress; the liberation of the nationalist force from governmental repression by the slogan of non-violence and the adoption of the techniques of non-cooperation; non payment of taxes and Civil Disobedience. But at the later stage of his life he has developed severe disagreement with Gandhi and criticised him for many of his ideas.

*** Roy's critique on Gandhi's Idea of Non Violence:** Roy has great admiration towards Gandhi and he was quite fascinated with the prompt leadership provided by Gandhi. But he was quite critical about his idea of Non violence and Satyagraha. For him, Non violence and Satyagraha are two ideologies used by Gandhi and his nationalist followers were politically restrictive. By this he means that, the Gandhi led - nationalist forces and those who were supporting imperialism used these two tools in order to entertain the political interest of few. In his words, non-violence was a cloak *" ... to serve the interests of those who have built castles of social privilege and*

economic exploitation. If the end of nationalism is to glorify the privileged few, then non-violence is certainly useful; but to nationalism of a broader kind, which is the expression of the desire of the entire Indian people, it is a positive hindrance." He went further alleging that, Nonviolence was a tactic adopted by a few at the cost of the majority.

*** Roy's critique on Gandhi's Idea of Non Cooperation:** Roy was also critical about the ideology of Non cooperation. He argued that, the idea of non cooperation was used by the middle class to prevent the development of dynamic revolutionary forces which threaten the Indian Nationalism in to back foot. The strategy of Non cooperation which was not originally belonging to Gandhi as argued by Roy was mainly adopted by Gandhi to call to an end to the revolutionary tactics of the revolutionary forces. He was also critical about the sudden withdrawal of Non Cooperation by Gandhi. Roy said that, Gandhi had withdrawn Non Cooperation because of his realisation that a revolutionary outburst was challenging the ideological basis of Non cooperation. To quote him, *"with one single breath, the Mahatma thus blows up the beautiful castle built so laboriously during all these years of storm and stress."* Roy further doubted the surrender of Non Cooperation by Gandhi is for the purpose of his release from the Jail and in lieu of which he had been used as an instrument by the Colonial power to contain the movements which were threatening the foundation of the colonial power.

*** Roy's critique on Gandhi's Idea of Swaraj:** M. N. Roy is also critical of Gandhi's concept of Swaraj. In one of his work – *The Cult of Non – Violence: Socio-Economic Background*, Roy mentioned that, the people of India did not favoured Swaraj because of its vague nature. During his association with Congress he was not critical about the concept of Swaraj. He in his work *India in Transition* (1922), had also praised Swaraj, but slowly because of his inclination towards Marxism Roy started developing a critical perspective against it. He criticised Swaraj merely as reconciliatory concept and lacks revolutionary insights. He found two reasons why Swaraj lacked revolutionary potentials were – first, Congress lacks revolutionary leadership and secondly, it lost public support. Moreover, Roy claimed that the idea of Swaraj lost its mass appeal as it represented the political interest of the exploiting class and not the political interest of the working or peasant class. Hence, he proposed an alternative programme of action for Revolutionary Nationalist Party to substitute Swaraj. These were as follows:

1. Nationalist independence.
2. Abolition of feudalism and landlordism.
3. Nationalisation of land.
4. Modernisation of agriculture by state aid.
5. Nationalisation of mines and public utilities.
6. Development of modern industries.
7. Protection of workers, minimum wages, eight-hour day, abolition of child labour, insurance and other advanced social legislation.
8. Free and compulsory primary education.
9. Freedom of religion and worship.
10. Rights of minorities.

*** Roy's critique on Gandhi's Constructive Programme:** M. N. Roy was also critical about the Gandhi's constructive programme. The constructive programme was declared by Congress Working Committee on 12th February, 1922 at Bardoli

immediately after the event of Chauri Chaura. The ambition of the programme is to ensure economic well being of the masses. The agendas under the programme were: a) Charkha, b) Khaddar, c) removal of untouchability and d) fight against drinking alcohol. These programmes have both economic and social in nature. The first two programmes are economic programmes whereas the last two are social programmes. Roy, however found these constructive programmes as highly inadequate for a nation like India. He further argued that adoption of these programmes were not appropriate for India as they lack long term benefits. While talking about the first two programmes Roy said that, *Charkha* was not popular among the masses and *Khaddar* was costly for the common man to wear in daily basis. Moreover, Roy warned that the forceful home spun was another reason of the decline of the Swadeshi campaign. Referring to *charkha* he said it is not economically viable, because *Khaddar* has a high price which affects its selling capacity. Referring to the other two constructions Roy illustrated that, banning untouchability and alcohol might have a propaganda value but lacked practical utility. Because both of these habits were inbreeded in the Indian Psyche and it had become an age old prejudice. To done with it was almost next to impossible. From Roy's criticism it was assumed that he was cynical on Gandhi's Constructive Programme as verbally correct but practically irrelevant.

Check Your Progress – 3

1. Who wrote the book, *The Cult of Non – Violence: Socio-Economic Background* ?
2. Do you agree that M. N. Roy's opinion on the Idea of Non violence and Satyagraha as Politically Restrictive is correct? Justify your argument.
3. Why M. N. Roy criticised Gandhi's idea of Swaraj?
4. Mention two reasons why one may called M. N. Roy as the Critique of Gandhi.

2.6 LET US SUM UP

Let us now sum up what we have learned from this unit:

- The unit made an attempt to discuss the life sketch of M. N. Roy and his time.
- The unit also refereed to why M. N. Roy's political philosophy has shifted from Marxism to Radical Humanism.
- In the subsequent section of the unit referred to different political philosophies developed by M. N. Roy, such as his idea of Radical Humanism, New Humanism, his critique on Gandhian thoughts.
- We also learned about the major assumptions of Radical Humanism.
- We also discuss the major critique of Radical Humanism.
- In the next section of the unit we emphasised on the critique of M. N. Roy on the established ideas of Karl Marx.
- Followed by that we learn in details about the concept of New Humanism and its some major criticism.
- We also learned about the grounds on which M. N. Roy criticised Gandhi and his political philosophy.
- So in this unit we have tried to understand the major political philosophy of M. N. Roy. In the next unit we shall be learned about political philosophy of B. R. Ambedkar.

2.7 KEY WORDS

Radical Humanism: Radical Humanism is a concept developed by M. N. Roy to refer to utmost necessity of Individual and the recognition of their capabilities. It is a school of thought developed by him to question the Marxist interpretation of Individual Liberation from the interference created by a Class. Therefore, generally radical humanism stands for Critique of Marxian thoughts.

New Humanism: The New Humanism was a political philosophy developed by M. N. Roy. By New Humanism Roy emphasised on socio – economic and political reconstruction of Human society. It is a socio – political emancipation of human being which is based on Freedom, Morality and Rationality.

Marxism: Marxism is a political philosophy and a school of thought extending the political philosophy of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels by their successors. It is a combination of those lessons left by Marx and Engels in order to study human history from a class perspective. These are also the philosophies which latter become the basis of communism.

2.8 SUGGESTED READINGS

Chakrabarty Bidyut and Pandey Rajendra Kumar, *Modern Indian Political Thought: Text and Context*, Sage Publications, New Delhi. 2009.
Kaviraj Sudipta, *The Heteronymous Radicalism of M.N. Roy*, in Thomas Pantham and Kenneth L. Deutsch (eds), Political Thought in Modern India, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1986.
Bali D R, *Modern Indian Thought: Rammohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan,* Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1984.
Jayapalan N, *Indian Political Thinkers: Modern Indian Political Thought,* Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.

POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress -1

1. The three books wrote by M. N. Roy are - India in Transition (1922), One Year of Non-Cooperation from Ahmedabad to Gaya (1923) and The Future of Indian Politics (1926).
2. The political tradition influenced M. N. Roy at the early stage of his career was the political revolutionary ideas of B. C. Pal, Aurobindo Ghosh and Surendra Nath Banerjee. His involvement in the direct revolution was mainly moulded by his association with Jatin Mukherjee and the active Leadership and members of 'Yugantara Group'. However, because of his inclination into revolution he had quite inducted into the philosophy of Karl Marx, this had also facilitated him to come into a close contact with some of the greatest Marxists his contemporary time.
3. By radical humanism M. N. Roy mean to ensure the freedom of the individuals. The idea why he used radical before humanism is the realisation that individual liberty was almost missing in the 19^{th} century liberalism. He hence aimed to revive liberty of individual. He presumed that greater the rationalism of the individuals composing a society, the larger would be the measure of freedom enjoyed by them. The object of radical humanist was to organised the society in a rational manner.
4. M.N. Roy has many disagreements with Marx and his philosophies. The three major disagreement of him are as follows:

a. He regarded the ethical foundations of Marxism as weak as they were dogmatic and their religious basis was indefensible. The subordination of man to the irresistible dominance of forces of production counterbalanced the autonomy and creativity of Individuals. Roy's humanist ethics acclaimed sovereignty of man and believed in the value based hierarchy of freedom and justice. Thus in place of the Marxist thesis which interprets ethical norms in terms of class struggles, Roy accepts that there is something permanent in ethnical values, it is mainly situational.
b. Roy denounces Marxism for its rejection of the liberal concept of individualism. He emphasised that rejection of the liberal and utilitarian concept of the individual amounted to betrayal of Marx's early humanism. He opined that, Marx had done so, under the influence of the Hegelian thesis of moral positivism which standardised class as norms of the society. Thus minimising the role of the individual.
c. Roy did not accept Marxian philosophy of class struggle. He opined that history speaks of other social classes also, besides the two classes referred by Marx. Unlike Marx he believed that, history of man is not always the history of class struggle. Besides tension and struggle, a social cohesive bond also had been operative. Moreover, he argued that, the Contemporary Society had not been bifurcated into antithetical polarised sector as envisaged by Karl Marx in his 'Communist Manifesto'. It further created doubts in the mind of Roy regarding Marxian thesis.

5. The two major criticisms of M. N. Roy are:

- Firstly, as Roy believed that all the living bodies originated out of the matter is not free from criticism. He had even stressed that the mind is also a product of matter. But Roy did not give rational and adequate justifications how the living bodies are emerged out of matter. Moreover, Roy also developed his theory on the presumption that man is essentially a rational being and man decided everything by reason. But, unfortunately Roy had failed to explain the term 'reason' clearly.
- Secondly, Roy also condemned religion as an obstacle in the development of freedom. But one may not agree with him on this point. Practically, religion plays a very significant role in the cultural and intellectual development of our society. Moreover, Religion is a part of human life and It is quite undesirable to condemn the institution of religion, which plays a very important role in human life. Therefore, one may criticise Roy for developing a negative perspective on religion.

Check Your Progress- 2

1. Yes, I agree that New Humanism is different from Radical Humanism. M. N. Roy did not confine himself only into radical humanism. Rather, there was a change from Radicalism to integral scientific humanism or New Humanism from the year 1947 to 1954.
2. Fill in the blanks:

c. The Major foundation of New Humanism is Cosmopolitanism.
d. The European Philosophy of liberalism and Humanism influenced M. N. Roy while discussing about New Humanism.

3. The three instincts of man integral to humanism are – Freedom, Reason and Morality.

4. The major essence of New Humanism is to secure social, economic and political freedom among the individual. It is the mixture of Individualism, Humanism and Utilitarianism. The idea of New humanism is so establish a social order where the individual is devoid of any kind of hindrances.

Check Your Progress- 3

1. The book, *The Cult of Non – Violence: Socio-Economic Background* was wrote by M. N. Roy.
2. I agree, that M. N. Roy's opinion on the Idea of Non violence and Satyagraha as Politically Restrictive is correct. As believed by him, Non violence and Satyagraha are two ideologies used by Gandhi and his nationalist followers were politically restrictive. Because as said by Roy, Gandhi and his Nationalist Forces and those who were supporting imperialism used these two tools in order to satisfy the political interest of a few. To quote him, non-violence was a cloak *" ... to serve the interests of those who have built castles of social privilege and economic exploitation. If the end of nationalism is to glorify the privileged few, then non-violence is certainly useful; but to nationalism of a broader kind, which is the expression of the desire of the entire Indian people, it is a positive hindrance."* Therefore from the above quotation it was seen that Non violence was an envelope by which Gandhi and his followers tried to cover the hidden interest of them which was to gather social privilege and economically exploit the other.
3. M. N. Roy criticised Gandhi's concept of Swaraj for the following reasons:
   a. Firstly, in one of his work – *The Cult of Non – Violence: Socio-Economic Background*, Roy mentioned that, the people of India did not favoured Swaraj because of its vague nature.
   b. Secondly, he criticised Swaraj merely as reconciliatory concept and lacks revolutionary insights. He found two reasons why Swaraj lacked revolutionary potentials were – first, Congress lacks revolutionary leadership and secondly, it lost public support.
   c. Thirdly, Roy claimed that the idea of Swaraj lost its mass appeal as it represented the political interest of the exploiting class and not the political interest of the working or peasant class. Hence, he proposed an alternative programme of action for Revolutionary Nationalist Party to substitute Swaraj.
4. The two reasons why one may called Roy as a critique of Gandhi were:
   a. Roy was a critique of Gandhi's Idea of Non Cooperation. Roy was critical about the ideology of Non cooperation. He argued that, the idea of non cooperation was used by the middle class to prevent the development of dynamic revolutionary forces which threaten the Indian Nationalism in to back foot. The strategy of Non cooperation which was not originally belonging to Gandhi as argued by Roy was mainly adopted by Gandhi to call to an end to the revolutionary tactics of the revolutionary forces. He was also critical about the sudden withdrawal of Non Cooperation by Gandhi. Roy said that, Gandhi had withdrawn Non Cooperation because of his realisation that a revolutionary outburst was challenging the ideological basis of Non cooperation.
   b. Secondly, M. N. Roy was also a critique of Non Violence and Satyagraha. In his opinion the Idea of Non violence and Satyagraha was Politically Restrictive. As believed by him, Non violence and Satyagraha are two

ideologies used by Gandhi and his nationalist followers were politically restrictive. Because as said by Roy, Gandhi and his Nationalist Forces and those who were supporting imperialism used these two tools in order to satisfy the political interest of a few.

REFERENCES

Bali D R, *Modern Indian Thought: Rammohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan,* Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1984.

Chakrabarty Bidyut and Pandey Rajendra Kumar, *Modern Indian Political Thought: Text and Context*, Sage Publications, New Delhi. 2009.

Jayapalan N, *Indian Political Thinkers: Modern Indian Political Thought,* Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.

Kaviraj Sudipta, *'The Heteronymous Radicalism of M.N. Roy'*, in Thomas Pantham and Kenneth L. Deutsch (eds), Political Thought in Modern India, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1986.

Kaviraj Sudipta, *The Heteronymous Radicalism of M.N. Roy*, in Thomas Pantham and Kenneth L. Deutsch (eds), *Political Thought in Modern India*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1986.

Overstreet G.D. and Marshall Windmiller, *Communism in India*, Perennial Press, Bombay, 1960.

Ray Sibnarayan, *Selected Works of M.N. Roy, 1917–1922*, Volume – I, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2000.

WEB REFERENCES

- https://lohiatoday.com/CollectedWorks/MNRoy/MMNR-11-NewHumanism-Manifesto.pdf

MODEL QUESTIONS

1. What do you mean by Radical Humanism? How M. N. Roy criticised Marxism?
2. Discuss the major assumptions of Radical Humanism and its criticism.
3. M. N. Roy is a humanist – Justify your argument.
4. Define New Humanism. What are the major aspects of New Humanism developed by M. N. Roy?
5. Broadly discuss the M. N. Roy's criticism on Gandhian Political Tradition.
6. M.N. Roy is an ardent critique of Gandhi and his political philosophies – Do yu agree with this statement? Justify.

Unit-III

B. R. Ambedkar

Structure:-

3.0 Objectives

After going through, this unit you will be able to;

- Get an idea about the early life of Ambedkar and major influence on his ideas
- Conceptualize the major ideas Ambedkar on sociology-political issues and his role in bringing social reform
- Analyse Ambedkar role in the framing of Indian Constitution.

3.1 Introduction

In the earlier units we have already discussed the political philosophy of M.K. Gandhi and M.N. Roy. Among the other major Indian political thinkers, Dr B. R. Ambedkar is revered by most of the Indians as a political leader, as a great jurist and as one of the framers of the Indian Constitutions. He was a versatile genius who left an indelible mark on social, political and intellectual life of modern India. But above all, he is remembered for his unrelenting fight to abolish untouchability. He was the social prophet of the untouchables. But at the same time, his role to create a modern Indian polity and his role to strengthen its unity integrity has been rare. In fact he was one of the architects of modern Indian republic for which he has been largely acclaimed as the "Modern Manu".

3.2 A Brief sketch of the early life of Ambedkar:

Bhimarao Ramji Ambedkar was born at Ambedgaon village in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra. He was born in an untouchable Sakbal Mahar Community, in the town and military cantonment of Mhow in the Central Provinces. He was the 14^{th} and last child of Ramji Maloji Sakpal and Bhimbai. Ambedkar's ancestor had for long been in employment of the British East India Company and his father served in the Indian army at the Mhow cantonment.

Bhimrao was enrolled at school when he was five years old at Dapoli in the Ratnagiri District of Maharashtra. Bhim began to notice that he and his family were treated differently. Being an untouchable, Ambedkar underwent an inhuman treatment from his childhood. At school, the teacher didn't touch his notebooks due to the fear of being polluted , the barbers who claimed social superiority over the untouchables refused to cut his hair and the bullock cart man refused to carry him. At high school in the Elphinstone High school in Bombay, he had to sit in the corner of the room on a rough mat away from the desks of the other pupils. At break time, he was not allowed to drink water using the cups of his fellow school children. These experiences were permanently etched into his mind. He realised that this was the plight of anyone born untouchable. Despite these humiliations, Ambedkar passed his Matriculation in 1907. Before that in 1906, his marriage to a nine year old girl Ramabai was arranged. This was a great event to be remembered as a boy from the untouchable Mahar family passed the matriculation. The Mahars felicitated him on his achievements. Bhim joined the Elphinstone College for further education. After completing his intermediate course, Bhimrao received a scholarship from the Maharaja of Baroda, Sayaji Rao and attained a Bachelor in Arts in 1912. His wife, by then 19 years old gave birth to his first son Yashwant, in the same year. Ambedkar had just moved his young family and started work when he dashed back to Mumbai to see his ailing father who died on February 2, 1913. Ambedkar lost an inspiring friend and father.

But again the Maharaja of Baroda, Gackward sent him to the United States for higher studies. He had been awarded a Baroda state Scholarship of £11.50 (Sterling) per month for three years under a scheme established by the Gackward of Baroda that

was designed to provide opportunities for post graduate education at Colombia University. He became the first Mahar untouchable to read in a foreign university- a unique opportunity for an Indian indeed. In turn, Bhimrao would have served the state of Baroda for ten years. He passed his M.A in June 1915 majoring in Economics, with Sociology as other subjects of study and presented a thesis titled "Ancient Indian Commerce". In May 1916, he read a paper on "The Castes in India, their mechanism, genesis and development" at the Anthropology seminar sponsored by Dr Goldonweisir. In turn 1916 he submitted his thesis for PhD degree on the topic "National Dividend for India: A Historic and Analytics Study". This was later published in the form of a book entitled, "The Evolution of Provincial Finance in British India". From Colombia University, he went to London School of economics as a graduate student. But his scholarship was terminated and he had to come back to India.

The Maharaja of Baroda appointed Dr. Ambedkar as his political Secretary in the Baroda Civil Service. Bhimrao now held a doctorate and was being trained for a top job. Yet he again ran into worst features of the Hindu caste system.

No one at the office where he worked would have hand over files and papers to him - the servant threw them onto his desk. Nor would they give him water to drink. No respect was given to him merely because of his caste.

This was all the more painful for Bhimrao because for the past four years, he has been abroad, living free from the label of untouchable. Ambedkar could realise the condition of millions of his untouchable brothers. After only eleven days of his new job he resigned his post, left Baroda and came to Bombay.

In 1918 he joined the Sydenham College in Bombay. There his students recognised him as a brilliant teachers and scholar. But there also, social treatment did not change. With the help of Shahu Maharaj of Kolhapur, a sympathizer of the cause for the upliftment of the depressed classes, he stated a fortnightly newspaper the "Mooknayak" (Leader of the Dumb) on January 31, 1920. The Maharaja also convened many meetings and conference of the untouchable which Bhimrao addressed. In September 1920, after accumulating sufficient funds, Ambedkar went back to London to complete his studies. He became a barrister and got a Doctorate in Science. In June 1921, he presented his theses "Provincial Decentralization of Imperial Finance in British India and got M.A degree in Economics from London. He also completed his Bar at law and came back to India to join the Bar in April, 1923.

Back to India, Ambedkar gradually realised that nothing has changed. His qualifications meant nothing as far as the evil practice of untouchability was concerned- -it was still an obstacle to his career. But there was no doubt that he has received the best education anyone on the world could get and was well equipped to be a leader of the Dalit community. He was an expert on the law and could give convincing evidence before British Commissions as an eloquent and gifted speaker. Bhimrao dedicated the rest of his life to this task.

In July 1924, he founded the Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha (Outcastes Welfare Associations). The aim of the Sabbha was to uplift the downtrodden socially and politically and bring them to the level of others in the Indian society. In 1927, he led the Mahar March at the Chowder Tank at Colaba, near Bombay, to give the Untouchables the right to draw water from the public tank where he burnt copies of the Manusmriti publicly.

Check Your progress: (1)

(a) Name the newspaper started by Ambedkar.

(b) What was the topic on which Ambedkar submitted his PhD thesis?

3.3 Ambedkar as a social Revolutionary

Experiences of personal humiliation and inhuman treatment meted to him were so bitter that Ambedkar could not but revolt against the social taboos created by the Hindus against untouchables. His experience however did not embitter Ambedkar against Hindus at the individual level. But he worked actively against Hinduism, especially Brahmanism, because it stood in the way of establishment of an egalitarian society. The aim of human society, the thought, must be to enable every person to lead a rich, all round life involving as much as the cultivation of the mind as also the satisfaction of basic physical wants.

Ambedkar was deeply influenced by Buddha, Kabir and Jyotiba Phooly. Buddha and Kabir shaped his philosophical conviction of human equality. Jyotiba Phooly a social reformer taught him to fight against higher caste supremacy and elevation of the masses thought education and economic upliftment. Ambedkar's idea became to establish a society based on liberty, equality and fraternity. He was determined to fight against the caste system. He gave precedence to social change over political independence. His mission became to oppose the orthodoxical social arrangements and fight for political rights of the untouchables. Both society and politics became his area of operation.

Ambedkar analysed Hindu society before starting his struggle against untouchabilty and the caste system. He tried to analyse the origin of caste system and untouchabilty before starting his fight against them. Ambedkar realised that the lower castes were oppressed on account of two reasons: they had potentially internalised hierarchy, and because of the very characteristics of caste based inequality. Therefore, Ambedkar appealed the people of lower castes to reform their way of life. He urged them to stop the carrying of dead cattle out of the village. He advised them to give up eating carrion, alcoholic drinks and begging. He urged them to educate themselves and dress well. Ambedkar tried to endow the lower castes with a glorious history of sons of the soil to help them acquire an alternative, not caste based identity, to regain their self respect and overcome their divisions.

Ambedkar was totally committed to the annihilation of the caste system. According to him caste system is not merely a division of labour but a division labourer. It is a hierarchy in which the division of labourers is graded one above other. The division of labour is based on neither natural aptitude nor choice of the individual concerned. It is therefore harmful in as much as it involves the subordination of man's natural power and inclinations to the exigencies of social rules.

Ambedkar great visions enjoyed the abolition of casteism in every shape and form since he was opposed to all divisive forces and aimed at strengthening the impulse of national integration.

Ambedkar's philosophy was that self-respect and human dignity were of paramount importance in a free republic. He espoused the noble cause of equality of status and opportunity to every Indian assuring the dignity of the individual and unity of the nation. He was not merely a learned man, but also an intellectual who sacrificed his life for the dignity and uplift of the poor of the world.

His aim was not communal and not limited to personal benefit, but it was essentially social and human, related to all whom suffer from slavery, injustice, tyranny and exploitation. Dr. Ambedkar's principle was not to fight against the

particular person who created a frustrating situation for him and his fellow sufferers, because the cause of the situation was not these persons but the social philosophy which supported a social system of inequalities.

Check Your Progress (2):

- Name the persons who influenced Ambedkar's thought.

3.4 Ambedkar's Concept of an Ideal Society (New Social Order)

Ambedkar was the protagonist of a new social order which was to be based on the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. His views on social problem like caste, untouchablity and women constitute the foundations of his socio-political ideas. His own experiences in life and his intellectual faculty made him sceptical about the Hindu religion and its social order. His pragmatism and idealism prompted him to work for a new social order based on social justice so that the future of Indian democracy would be strong and stable.

Ambedkar was a spokesman of the ignored humanity. He expressed the sorrow of the untouchables and tried sincerely to channel the activities of the depressed classes. The socially progressive values that Dr Ambedkar cherished were the basis of his social and political life. Though he was born in the Mahar community, he never represented his own community but represented all those communities which were socially and economically downtrodden. He has been variously described as a crusader for the rights of the depressed classes of India, a literary genius, an eminent educationist, a political philosopher and an able parliamentarian. Ambedkar started a movement for attainment of self respect for the untouchable as well as depressed classes. He carried on a relentless struggle against the social, political and economic segregation of these classes.

Ambedkar realised that only a society based on fraternity would make democracy successful. He believed that democracy is not merely a form of governments; it is primarily a mode of associated living of conjoint communicated experience. It is essentially an attitude or respect of reverence for follow men. In democracy, there should be freedom to choose one's profession. To talk of democracy and not to allow this freedom is to perpetuate slavery. Though equality in absolute sense is not possible but equal treatment of men is possible. Since caste and untouchability negate such ideas, he demanded that caste and untouchability in any form should be abolished.

Caste System:

According to Ambedkar, the Hindu scheme of social structure based on the four Varna's or chaturvarna breeds inequality and has been the parent of the caste system untouchablity. In Hinduism, everything is caste oriented and caste bound. Caste determines ones status in society. According to the caste Hindu, the four castes came from different parts of the Brahman. The highest castes are the Brahmins of whom the books of the Hindus tell that day they were created from the head of Brahman. They study and teach the Vedas. In Hindu society they were considered best of humankind. The next caste is the Kshatriyas who were created from the shoulder and hands of Brahman. Kshatriyas protect the creatures created by God. The Vaishyas were created from the thighs of the Brahman. They were expected to meet the material needs of the community. They Sudras were created from the Brahmans feet and they are supposed to serve all other groups. It is believed that the Dharma for each individual is determined by his origin, because the nature of every person is originally determined.

The practice of the caste system which refuses to recognize all human beings equal is very strong in India. The social system is based on a gradation of caste forming an ascending scale of reverence and a descending scale of contempt, a system which gave no scope for the growth of the sentiment of equality and fraternity so essential for a democratic form of government. The caste system is not just a division of labours, but on a hierarchical division of labourers which is not based on natural aptitudes or spontaneity but on the caste of parents.

Ambdekar denounced the caste system as a totally unscientific because caste has no scientific origin. He believed that in no civilised society there is unnatural division of labour into water tight compartments. This unnatural division of labour involves on attempt to appoint tasks to individual on the basis of social status of parents and not on the basis of original capacities of individuals.

To remedy this situation, Ambedkar believed that caste cannot simply be abolished by forced inter- caste marriages and inter- dining. What is needed is notional change. Hindus observe caste not because they are inhuman but because their religion and religious scriptures have taught them so. People being religious minded observe it blindly. He urges upon the people to free themselves from the thraldom of the Shastras and cleanse their minds of the pernicious notions founded in the Shatras. People must deny the authority of the Shatras like Buddha and Nanak.

Untouchability:

Untouchability means pollution by the touch of certain persons by reasons of their birth in particular caste or family. It leads to defilement pollution and contamination. It is believed that the practice of untouchabiity is peculiar to Hindu society.

Untouchability originated in India around 400AD and it arose out of the struggle for supremacy between Buddhism and Brahmanism. Untouchability is a term used by Ambedkar himself for those lowest castes in Hindu scale of pollution. During the pre-independence era, the term "Depressed Classes" was used to denote the untouchables. This was replaced by 'Scheduled Castes' in 1935 when these castes were placed on a Schedule as qualifying for special right. Gandhiji's name for the untouchables, "Harijan" dates from 1933-34 campaign against untouchability and is in general usage except among Ambedkar followers.

The origin of untouchability is an enigma for mankind. But it is generally held that it is a perverted outcome of the caste system.

Ambedkar himself belonging to the group of untouchables dealt with the problem from both historical and social perspective. He made a detailed analysis of origin and practice of untouchability in his books entitled, "The Untouchables" published in 1948. Ambedkar in his book rejected the idea of pollution attached to the untouchables. Thus he conceptualised the practise of untouchablity as baseless. Purification and defilement attached to the untouchability can neither be applicable to a group nor can it be a hereditary basis. An individual can be impure or defilement is observed in case of birth, death etc. It cannot be imposed over any group or race. Hence Ambedkar demanded total abolition of untouchability. He believed that abolition of untouchability would be possible for both legal and social ways. Socially the untouchables themselves should rise to the occasion. They should give up traditional occupation like carrying dead cow out of the villages and should give up drinking. They should also be educated. Secondly, he fought for the cause of representation of all the untouchables at all levels of governments. As a result, Poona Pact Agreement was made for reservation of seats in general electorate. According to

Ambedkar, untouchables must be seen as a minority as long as they are treated as a separate people. And so long as they have special needs, must be represented in the government by the untouchables themselves. The government must initiate welfare measures for the untouchables.

Women:

Dr. Ambedkar was not only the champion of the cause of untouchable and depressed classes but that of the women also. Ambedkar was influenced by Buddha's view about women. Buddha described women as one of the seven treasures and a thing of supreme value.

He was convinced that for social justice and progress of the nation, it was essential that the conditions of women should be improved a lot. A family can be saved from debacle by placing a woman in authority over their affairs. He stood for the economic equality of women and vehemently pleaded for the spread of women education. The Hindu code Bill, piloted by him, and empowered women to equally inherit property. The Bill also included the abolition of the doctrine of rights by birth, provision for inter-caste marriage and divorce. But the bill could not be adopted because of the conspiracy by some higher caste Hindu leaders. In protest Ambedkar resigned from Nehru's cabinet on September 27, 1951.

Ambedkar blamed Manu for giving women degraded position in the society. He said "according to Manu, women have no right to study the Vedas". This view of women was both an insult and an injury to the women of India. It deprived women of the right to acquire knowledge. It also debarred woman from participating in religious activities by the Brahmins. He said, 'Manu also deprived women form their social freedom. As a result women in modern times also suffer from oppression and humiliation in society. Hence he fought for giving justice to women.'

Ambedkar was not a Marxist but believed that a social revolution must precede political independence. Ambedkar ventilated this view during the freedom movement and was misunderstood. But now the entire nation realise the relevance of his social ideas.

3.5 Organisation of the Depressed Classes

Ambedkar realised the inevitability of organising the depressed classes to agitate against the social wrongs in which they have been experiencing age long suffering. He sought to mobilize untouchables under one fold and for which he established an organisation called "**Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha**" in 1924. The motives of the sabha was to "Educate, Agitate and Organise." Initially Ambedkar visited different places in Maharashtra to initiate struggle for future reforms by promoting their education by organising and making them agitate for their right. Later he visited different places all over India to fortify the struggle. Under the objectives of Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha in January 1925, a hostel was inaugurated for the untouchable educated boys by facilitating cloths, books and the required stationary. Through education which is an instrument of knowledge, he generated social and revolutionary consciousness among untouchables.

About political representation for the depressed classes, Ambedkar held that the Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha was opposed to the principle of nomination. It insisted on the principle of election for depressed classes. Regarding the system of election, he stated that the Sabha doesn't wish to ask for communal electorate. In its opinion it would be sufficient if the depressed classes are provided with reserved seats in the

general constituencies. Further he demanded protection through guarantees which includes;

(1) That the education of the depressed classes shall be recognised as the first charge on the revenue of the province and that an equitable and just proportion of the total grant for education should be earmarked for the benefit of the Depressed Classes.

(2) That the right of the Depressed Classes to unrestricted recruitments in the army, navy, and the police shall be recognised without any limitation as to cost.

(3) That for a period of 30 years the right of the depressed classes for priority in the matter of recruitments to all posts, gazetted as well as non gazetted in all civil services shall be recognised.

(4) That the right of the Depressed Classes to the appointment of a Special Inspector of police form amongst themselves for every district shall be recognised.

(5) That the right of the depressed class to effective representation on the local bodies shall be recognised by the provincial government.

(6) That the right of the depressed classes to appeal to the government of India, in case of violation of these rights by the provincial Governments, the Governments shall be given the power to compel the provincial governments to conform to the law in the matter.

Check Your Progress (3):

- Name the organisation formed by Ambedkar for organisation of the Depressed Classes.

3.6 Ambedkar and Poona Pact

Due to Ambedkar's prominence and popular support amongst the untouchable community, he was inviting to attend the Second Round Table Conference in London in 1932. In this conference, he emphasized the separate identity of the untouchables in India and demanded the status o f separate electorate for them. On this question, he had confrontation with Gandhiji in the 2nd round Table Conference held from September to December 1931. The British Government accepted Ambedkar's demand and granted "Communal Award "in the 1932 providing for separate electorate for the depressed Classes. In protest, Gandhi resorted to fasting unto Death. Gandhi's fast provoked huge civil unrest across India and orthodox Hindu leaders, Congress politician and activist such as Madan Mohan Malavya and Palwankar Baloo organised joint meetings with Ambedkar and his supporters at Yerwada. Fearing a communal repraisal and genocide of untouchables, Ambedkar agreed under massive coercion from the supporters of Gandhi. This agreement, which saw Gandhi end his fast, was called the Poona act. As a result of the agreement, Ambedkar dropped the demand for separate electorate that was promised through the British Communal Award prior to Ambedkar meeting with Gandhi. Instead a certain number of seats were reserved specifically, for the untouchables (in the agreement, called the "Depressed Classes"). This agreement came to be known as the Poona Pact. The Pact was later embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935.

3.7 Ambedkar's role in framing Constitution of India

During the Second World War, Babasaheb was appointed Labour Minister by the Viceroy. He accepted it to prove that the untouchables can also administer. As the

labour minister, he was always in favour of the labourers. He said that labour ought to work for the total control over the government. As the Labour Minister in April 1944, he moved an amending bill proposing holidays with pay for industrial workers employed in perennial factories. He also moved a bill to amend the Indian Trade Union Act (1926). This bill sought to compel an employer to recognise a Trade Union. This measure was unique as it safeguarded the interest of working class. However, Babasaheb resigned from his post in the last week of May 1946. It was during this period that he initiated the formation of All India Scheduled Caste Federation. It functioned as a political party which contested the general election of 1946 but was completely routed. The motive behind the formation of this organisation was to keep the untouchables away from the organisation of higher caste dominance.

After the war, Babasahaeb was elected to the Constituent Assembly by the members of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly but lost from Bombay. He was also elected as the member of the Drafting Committee in the Constituent Assembly. When India became independent in August 1947, Babasaheb Ambedkar became the first Law Minister of Independent India. The Constituent Assembly made him Chairman of the Committee appointed to draft the Constitution for the world's largest democracy. The other member of the Drafting Committee was N.Gopalaswami Ayenger, Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar, K.M. Munshi, Sir Mohammad Sadullah, N Madhav Menon and D.P. Khaitan. B.N. Rao was the constitutional Advisor. Dr. Ambedkar's original genius and his rich experience in different constitutional system of the world contributed highly in the Constitution making process of India. He guided all the deliberations and decisions of the Constitutent Assembly and shared the benefit of his wisdom in creating a Constitution with the noble ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity.

All his study of law, economics and politics made him the best qualified person for this task. A study of the Constitution of many countries, a deep knowledge of law, and knowledge of the history of India and of Indian society- all these were essential. In fact, he carried the whole burden alone. He alone could complete this huge task.

On November 4, 1948 he presented the draft Constitution to the Constituent Assembly, and on November 26, 1949 it was adopted in the name of the people of India.

Later life – Buddhist Conversion:

Ambedkar realised that individual and group mobility were impossible with Hindu religion. The untouchables would not get justice under Hinduism, he believed.

In 1950, he went to a Buddhist Conference in Sri Lanka. On his return he spoke in Bombay at the Buddhist Temple-"In order to end their hardships, people should embrace Buddhism. I am going to spend the rest of my life to the revival and spread of Buddhism in India.' Babasaheb resigned from the Government in 1951. He felt that as an honest man he had no choice but to do so because the reforms so badly needed had not been allowed to come into being.

For the next five years Babsaheb carried on a relentless fight against social evils and superstitions. On October 14, 1956 at Nagpur he embraced Buddhism. He led a huge gathering in a ceremony converting over half a million people to Buddhism. Though many religious leaders of the world requested him to convert to Christianity and Islam, he converted to Buddhism. This he did because Buddhism, he said is a part of Indian Culture and second because Buddhism as a religion based on three principles of Knowledge, right path and Compassion. Ambedkar believed that by reviving

Buddhism would mean continuing India's best tradition. "Untouchability" is a product only of Hinduism.

Sudden Death:

Only seven weeks later on December 6, 1956 Babasaheb died at his Delhi residence. He went to Kathmandu to attend the world Buddhist Conference. He delivered lecture on Buddha and Manu. He came back to New Delhi and attended a function organised at the honour of the Dalai Lama. On December 4, 1956 he was present in the Council of States. But unfortunately on 6th December 1956 he never got up from his bed and joined eternity while in deep slumber. With his death, the era of self crusade for the cause of the depressed class and the downtrodden came to an end.

Check your Progress (4):

- Name the members of the Drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution.

3.8 Ambedkar's views on the Indian Political System

Bhim Rao was a social revolutionary and true liberal who worked for a new political order and envisioned a "peoples India" as well as a "United India". Indian polity since long has been undergoing a process of modernisation. Many great men have immensely contributed for modernising the polity. But a microscopic few like Ambedkar have played a multi-dimensional role in the modernisation process of the entire country. He is one among the few who realised that modernisation of the polity remains vague without social change. Accordingly, he started his political career as a social revolutionary. He always held the view that Hinduism was responsible for the disorganisation and demoralisation of Indian Society. With strong determination to fight social justice, Ambedkar started his social reform movement under the banner of "Bahiskrita Hitakarini Sabha."

Ambedkar believed in a democratic system of government and power to the people had been a major concern for him. He was very clear that unless citizen has power in their own hands, there could be no democracy.

That is why he says that democracy rests on four premises, where the citizen remains at the centre.

- The individual is an end in itself,
- The individual has certain inalienable rights, which must be guaranteed to him by the Constitution.
- The individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his constitutional rights as a price of any privilege.
- The state shall not delegate power to private persons to govern others.

The core of Dr. Ambedkar's Political thinking is contained in his two statements: (i) rights are protected not by law but by social and moral conscience of society. (ii) A democratic form of government presupposes a democratic form of society. Social conscience is the only safeguard of all rights, fundamental or non-fundamental. The prevalent views that, once rights are enacted in a law they are safeguarded, is unwarranted. The formal framework of democracy is of no value. Democracy is essentially a form of society, a mode of associated living. The roots of democracy are to be searched in the social relationships in the terms of associated life between the people who form a society.

Dr. Ambedkar's expertise as a constitutional expert went a long way in enriching the concepts of political democracy in the Indian constitution. To him political democracy cannot last unless there lies at the base of it social democracy.

Social democracy is a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as the principle of life. These principles are not to be treated as separate items but in a trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of democracy. Unless there is a social democracy, power to the people would remain a distant dream.

Ambedkar knew that mere adoption of a democratic system of government in the constitution would not be sufficient. Equality in each society, equality before law and administration, constitutional morality, lack of tyranny of the majority and developing public conscience are conditions for the success of democracy in India. The foremost condition for democracy, in Ambedkar's opinion, is equality in society as equality is the foundation stone where the notions of liberty and fraternity develop. He remarked that equality is the original notion for human personality is a reflection of it. If equality is denied, everything else may be taken to be denied.

Ambedkar was the first among the galaxy of social reformers in India who made a legal and political approach to the social problems in India. Dr. Ambedkar made a positive attempt to elevate the position of untouchables. From 1930 onwards, he devoted himself for the educational development of untouchables. Among a number of social reformers he was the first to fight for the political and legal rights of the untouchables, because according to him, a revolution is merely transference of political power from one party to another party. Real social change will occur if the revolution is accompanied by a redistribution of powers among the forces operating in the society. He prepared a declaration of fundamental rights safeguarding cultural, religious and economic rights of the depressed classes and submitted it to the minorities sub-committee. He was very much emphatic in his demand for abolishing untouchability and establishing equal citizenship.

Dr. Ambedkar believed that an egalitarian social order demands equality not only between men and men but also between men and women. As the Law Minister of India, Ambedkar introduced the Hindu Code Bill on February 5, 1951. The Hindu Code Bill introduced only four new things in their existing law. They were abolition of the doctrine of the rights by birth, right over property to women, share to daughters from the parental property and provision of divorce. Also it, insisted upon the consent of the wife to the adoption of a son by the husband. A daughter was permitted to be adopted. Thus he was a feminist of the first order in India. The main objectives behind Ambedkar's movements for social change have been primarily to establish an egalitarian social order, which will be the real foundation of a modern Indian polity.

Ambedkar's another mission has been to make the Indian polity free from economic exploitation. He strongly believes that a casteless and "classless "society should be the main foundation of Indian polity. The main plank was to abolish "Landlordism" and "Capitalism". In 1937 after being elected to Bombay Legislature Assembly, he took up the economic problem of the peasant, agricultural labourers and workers coming from all section of the society. It may be mentioned here that in the first popular provincial assembly, Ambedkar was the first legislator of India to introduce a bill for abolition of serfdom of agricultural tenants. He also dealt with the problems of landless labourer, small holding collective farming, land revenue, currency system, universalisation of education and abolishing of landlordism. As a labour member in the Executive Council for two Viceroys in India, he made significant contribution in the field of labour legislation and welfare in the country. He laid emphasis on equal treatment of labourers, whether industrial or agricultural.

What Ambedkar aimed at was to bring structural change in the economic life of the people so that there would be no scope for exploitation. Dr. Ambedkar was a great visionary. His vision was to build up a "People's" India, which would be strong and united. His pragmatic approach to achieve his goal made him different from others. He believed that a country may be independent but its people may not be independent. Only a privileged few many monopolise the entire gamut of power within a state. A polity having oppressors and oppressed was not acceptable to him. As a part of his mission to make India modern and civilised free from disharmony and disunity, he also undertook other problems of the polity.

Dr. Ambedkar also undertook the problems of language keeping in view the unity and integrity. He had suggested for one language, many states formula. He was against the creation of linguistic provinces. The patriotic mind of Ambedkar never thought of any threat to India's unity in the name of language. He strongly warned that just like one religion can unite the people, two languages are sure to divide people. In the draft Constitution, he made Hindi as the national language and Lion capital with Ashok Chakra as the national symbol of India. He wanted India to be a nation of peace and universal brotherhood.

Dr. Ambedkar was both a visionary and revolutionary. He was a liberal with a strong sense of nationalism. His unfathomable contribution for individual freedom, social justice, equality, unity, and integrity of the nation will be long remembered by the people of India. His pragmatic approach to the socio-economic problems of the country is still relevant today. In view of the present atrocities on the woman and depressed classes in India which has become an everyday affair, exploitation of the working class people and secessionist, linguistic problems, Ambedkarism provide solution.

3.9 Let Us Sum Up

Ambedkar was a great intellectual, a social revolutionary, a unique constitutionalist, an able administrator and a masterly statesman. Ambedkar was a crusader. He made a crusade against fundamentalism, traditionalism and dogmatism. He wanted to make Indian politics free from conservative and traditional forces. He envisioned the creation of 'People India' instead of 'Elites India', a secular India instead of a 'communal India'. Of late, Ambedkar has been recognised as a crusader and champion of social justice by all the political leaders. But the real tribute will be paid when our leaders work with heart and soul for the upliftment of the downtrodden and the oppressed. Simply eulogising Ambedkar for political purpose will not serve the real mission and vision of Ambedkar.

3.10 Key Words

* **Untouchable:** A person who occupies the lowest rung under the Hindu Social structure and considered impure or polluted.

3.11 Suggested Readings

** Suresh Dalal : *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission*, Madras: University of Madras, 1998.

** Sudarshan Agarwal (ed) : *Dr. Ambedkar: The Man and his Message*, New Delhi: Prentice hall, 1991.

** Andrew Heywood : *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*, Macmillan Press. London 1998.

** D. K. Mohanty : *Indian Political Tradition: From Manu to Ambedkar,* Anmol ublicPations, 2002.

Possible Answers to Check Your Progress

Check Your Progress (1)

(a) Mook Nayak in January 31, 1920.
(b) National Dividend for India: A historic and Analytic Study.

Check Your Progress (2)

Buddha, Kabir and Jyotiba Phooley.

Check Your Progress (3)

Bahiskrit Hitkarini Sabha.

Check Your Progress (4)

N. Gopalaswami Ayenger, Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayenger,

K.M. Munshi, Sir Md. Sadullah, N.Madhav Menon, D.P. Khaitan,

B.N. Rau and B.R. Ambedkar.

Model Questions

i) Give an account of the Movement launched by Dr. Ambedkar for the upliftment of the Depressed Classes.

ii) Give Ambedkar idea of an ideal social structure and highlight his role in the Framing of Indian Constitution.

iii) Analyse the major political ideas of B.R. Ambedkar and his views on the Indian Political System.